



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 2007

No. 41

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SOLIS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HILDA L. SOLIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

At the beginning of another day, we pray, Lord God, that divine providence guide this Nation and all nations, and every believer, each in his or her own way.

Help each of us, Lord, to accept the path to holiness upon which You draw us by Your word whispered in our hearts.

In Your Spirit, enable us to accomplish Your holy will by the detailed performance of everyday duties and routine tasks. Help us to do excellent work that will give You glory and satisfy our sense of purpose.

Strengthen us when it is difficult to accept what we cannot avoid and endure with love and resignation the things that could cause us to grow weary or become disgusted.

In truth, we do not see the whole picture or how we are already united in Your unconditional plan, so we must trust. We must place all our trust in You, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain five 1-minute speeches on each side.

DIFFERENCES IN STRATEGY BETWEEN ADMINISTRATION AND DEMOCRATS

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. There has been a lot of news on Iraq and the differing strategy between Congress and the President. Let's be clear about where the differences lie.

The administration wants more time after 4 long years in Iraq; Democrats say it's time for a conclusion to the open-ended commitment. The administration wants 25,000 more troops for Iraq; Democrats are calling for the troops to be fully trained and equipped. The administration wants more money; Democrats are demanding Iraqis be held accountable for Iraq's future.

The administration policy has us policing a civil war; Democrats want to focus on al Qaeda in Afghanistan. The administration has failed our veterans

on the health care they earned; Democrats are for making sure that the veterans get the health care they deserve.

As Yogi Berra once said, "When you come to a fork in the road, take it." Madam Speaker, the President wants and is asking for more of the same; Democrats are calling for a new direction.

PRAISING THE SOUTH CAROLINA MILITARY MUSEUM

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on February 6, the South Carolina Military Museum officially opened adjacent to the Bluff Road Armory. Five hundred guests gathered at the grand opening, where Adjutant General Stan Spears dedicated the museum in honor of all men and women who have served in the National Guard.

In 1981, the South Carolina National Guard Museum and State Weapons Collection opened in Sumter, South Carolina. Seventeen years later, the museum was renamed and moved to Columbia. Professionally organized by director and curator Ewell G. Buddy Sturgis, the museum seeks to preserve historically significant properties, to provide educational services, and to enhance esprit de corps among men and women serving in the South Carolina military.

Two years ago, Ross E. Beard, Jr., from Camden, South Carolina, loaned the museum a vast weapons collection dating from the 1500s. Mr. Beard has been collecting rare artifacts since he was 10 years old and is revered among

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2343

weapons collectors. He is a true inspiration to our troops who serve to protect our freedoms.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING THE STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Ms. GIFFORDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for fully funding the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, also known as SCAAP, at its authorized level for fiscal year 2008 at \$950 million.

This program, which reimburses State and local governments for the cost of incarcerating illegal immigrants, is vital to border States such as Arizona, where we disproportionately pay a higher amount than our fair share of incarceration.

Underfunding SCAAP places a significant cost burden on our local law enforcement, stretching their resources and hampering their ability to protect our communities.

All of the counties in my district, Pima, Cochise, Pinal and Santa Cruz, are reimbursed less than 10 percent of the amount of incarcerating illegal immigrants. This places an unfair cost burden on our local communities. Given the importance of homeland security and law enforcement, it is absolutely essential that we receive full funding for SCAAP. I believe that Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle would agree that reimbursement should be a Federal priority.

OPPOSE THE WAR FUNDING PROPOSAL

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is right and pass a clean supplemental.

The bill unveiled yesterday would tie our military leaders' hands at the very time they need our support the most. Some want to set a date certain. The reality is the only certain part of this plan is that President Bush has threatened to veto the bill, and critical funding for our troops would be needlessly delayed.

This plan is dangerous, and I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose this war funding proposal. Even Members of the majority party are reacting negatively to the proposal, as well they should.

Everyone agrees that we must make progress in Iraq. We also agree the Iraqi Government must step up and improve the situation. What the Republicans are going to stand against is tying the funds our soldiers need to do

their jobs to benchmarks thought up by special interest groups.

Our men and women in uniform deserve the best, and a haphazard approach is not it. We can do better. We must do better.

BETTER TREATMENT FOR OUR VETERANS

(Mr. KLEIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, in my district, which stretches along the coast line from West Palm Beach to Fort Lauderdale, we have a number of veterans who have served in wars for this country, ranging from World War II to Iraq and Afghanistan. These veterans have been served well in most cases by clinics in our district, such as the VA Hospital and other outpatient facilities in Fort Lauderdale. But like many places around the country, these facilities have their share of problems as well, largely due to a lack of adequate Federal funding. These facilities are not always able to see and treat the veterans as quickly as they would like to, and of course we all know what is going on at Walter Reed, mold seeping from the walls and ceilings, rats and roaches running freely. These conditions are fit for no one.

This is no way to treat our men and women in uniform who have sacrificed their families, their jobs, their lives, everything to serve our country. We must change the way we are treating our veterans when they return home, and that starts with providing critical funding for health care services and infrastructure needs. To ask them to sacrifice so much for us, only to find when they come home they are treated inadequately on so many fronts is nothing less than immoral.

BORDER PROTECTORS UNDER PHYSICAL ATTACK

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, more news from the second front: the border war with Mexico continues.

According to Reuters and NewsMax, illegals and drug cartels are increasing the tax on U.S. border protectors by the use of rocks, firearms, and even Molotov cocktails. Here is what Webb County, Texas Sheriff Rick Flores in Laredo says: "The attacks against us are becoming more brazen. Drug cartels are telling their people to go down fighting and do whatever is necessary to get those drugs through." He says, "Mexicans fire weapons from across the border at our law enforcement agents." In Arizona, illegals injure border agents by pelting them with large rocks and Molotov cocktails almost on a daily basis, according to one border agent.

And where are the two governments? Well, it seems Mexico could care less

what happens to American border agents since it encourages illegal entry, and our own U.S. Government takes the side of drug smugglers and illegals if border protectors allegedly use force to stop this invasion. Meanwhile, some in Washington fiddle the silly song of tolerance, amnesty and ignorance.

And that's just the way it is.

DEMOCRATS PROVIDING NEEDED OVERSIGHT OF BUSH ADMINISTRATION FAILURES

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, accountability has returned to Washington after a 6-year absence.

This week alone, the new Democratic Congress has provided critical oversight of the administration's unacceptable neglect of our wounded soldiers. At a hearing earlier this week, some of my Republican colleagues said they have known about some of the treatment for several years, but they didn't realize it was this bad. And that is what oversight hearings are for. If you know there is a problem, you haul the Pentagon up to Capitol Hill to get answers.

The old Republican Congress simply ignored these problems. That is not happening in the Democratic Congress. This week, we held four different oversight hearings so that we can find solutions quickly to ensure that what happened at Walter Reed never happens again.

This Democratic House has also held its first hearing this week on the scandal at the U.S. Attorney's Office, where politics once again trumps competence in the Bush administration. Eight U.S. attorneys were fired so the Bush administration could pad the resumes of other attorneys.

The days of incompetence without any accountability are over here in Washington. Real oversight has returned.

SCOOTER LIBBY

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, no town likes a scandal, real or invented, more than Washington, DC, and the latest news involving Scooter Libby has the Beltway crowd abuzz.

Madam Speaker, if Scooter Libby broke the law, he should be held to account. But with all the attention being paid to this scandal, I can't help but think of the double standard that seems to be at play here. Scooter Libby is being prosecuted for the exact same offense that ensnared former President Bill Clinton, lying under oath, perjury and obstruction of justice. But the same people today who are calling for Libby's head were insisting back then

that Bill Clinton's offense was no big deal. And the hypocrisy doesn't end there. Where was the liberal outrage when Sandy Berger was caught destroying classified documents and received a slap on the wrist? What about sweetheart land deals or refrigerated cash?

Madam Speaker, the American ideal is equal justice under the law. Let's enforce the law, and let's do so equally, regardless of politics.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 720, WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 229 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 229

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 720) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 0915

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. CASTOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 229 provides for the consideration of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the substitute reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, modified by the manager's amendment in the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended.

The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The amendments may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments, except for clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI, are waived. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

And I am pleased to point out, Madam Speaker, that under this structured rule, the six amendments made in order are split equally, three Republican and three Democratic.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 720 reauthorizes an important part of the landmark Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act protects our neighborhoods and water bodies from water pollution. Clean water is vital to the health of our citizens and to our country.

The bill before us today reauthorizes the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund by providing \$14 billion over the next 5 years to local agencies to fight water pollution.

We have come a long way in this country. We have the technology and the engineering experience to prevent

water pollution. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates a huge shortfall in funds available for wastewater improvements across the country. This shortfall is significant because, without considerable improvements to the wastewater treatment infrastructure, much of the progress made in cleaning up the Nation's rivers, creeks and streams and bays since the passage of the Clean Water Act is at risk.

Clean water is a top priority for the families in my district and throughout the Nation. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership over the past few Congresses has failed to support this part of the Clean Water Act. Although legislation was introduced in the Congress then, it never made it to the House floor.

President Bush and the White House also proposed slashing this Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund in his latest budget proposal. But, nevertheless, we are hopeful today that a bipartisan vote in support of this measure will send a signal to the White House that clean and healthy water is absolutely vital to our communities. In fact, in my hometown of Tampa, Florida, the Clean Water Act Loan Funds for wastewater improvements have vastly improved the water quality of Tampa Bay. The expansion in wastewater treatment significantly improved the quality of water running into beautiful Tampa Bay.

In past years, Tampa received over \$54 million for wastewater treatment plant expansion and thereby improved water quality. It has also played a role in significantly improving the water in our rivers, bays, creeks and streams as we are able to control the pollutants that run off into these vital water bodies.

This is the same story across the country for the improved health of our communities, on the Chesapeake Bay, the Great Lakes and other water bodies throughout our country. Check with your local governments and your neighbors who live around and who are mindful of the quality of the water in our lakes, rivers and bays in your hometown.

Appearing before our Rules Committee, House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman JIM OBERSTAR said it best: "This is not just a good bill. It is a necessary one. The good health of our communities depends upon it."

And as a former county commissioner, I can tell you that the vast majority of costs in cleaning our water falls upon our local communities. And if we don't act now, we will be shifting a greater cost to future generations.

So I urge the Congress, Madam Speaker, to enact this rule and this important legislation to keep our communities, rivers, lakes and bays clean and, most importantly, to improve the health of our children, seniors, and all citizens.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this modified closed rule and to the underlying legislation. I also rise, regrettably, to report to the American people that, for the second week in a row, the Democrat leadership is bringing legislation to the House floor that benefits big labor bosses at someone else's expense.

Last week, American workers were the losers in the Democrat-controlled House when the majority leadership forced through legislation that would provide for unprecedented intimidation of employees by union bosses under a fundamentally anti-democratic process known as card check.

This week, the Democrat leadership has set its sights on one of their favorite targets, the American taxpayer. But the other losers in this bargain are far more shocking. They include local communities across the United States, small and minority-owned businesses, and the environment.

H.R. 720 would provide for an unprecedented expansion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund or SRF. When the SRF was established, it applied Davis-Bacon only to the Federal portion of a Clean Water project. But today, in order to help big labor bosses pad their dwindling ranks, they would apply these same provisions to all non-Federal funds, such as loan repayments, State bond revenues, interest and State-matching funds.

Since the SRF program expired in 1995, no SRF project has been subject to Davis-Bacon. But today the Democrat Party wants to change that and to stack the deck in favor of big labor bosses whose ranks have dwindled to 12 percent in 2006 from their high of 35 percent in the 1950s.

I insert into the RECORD a letter from my colleague from Florida, JOHN MICA, to Rules Committee Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and Ranking Member DREIER detailing the specifics of this unprecedented expansion.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, March 8, 2007.

Hon. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER,
Chairwoman, Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVID DREIER,
Ranking Republican Member, Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN SLAUGHTER AND RANKING MEMBER DREIER: I appreciated the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Rules today concerning H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007. I am writing to clarify the point I made during the hearing this afternoon that this bill includes an unprecedented expansion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund (SRF).

When the Clean Water SRF was established it applied Davis-Bacon to amounts equal to the federal capitalization grant, also commonly referred to as the "first round". As such, states were not required to apply Davis-Bacon to all other available funding

sources states used for such projects. Non-federal money, such as loan repayments, state bond revenues, interest, and the state match, were therefore exempt from 1987 to 1995 when the SRF program expired. Since that time, no SRF project has been subject to Davis-Bacon.

H.R. 720 proposes to expand Davis-Bacon beyond federal capitalization grants to all non-federal money, and represents an unprecedented expansion of Davis-Bacon application to the SRF for water and sewer projects. Chairman Oberstar correctly stated that State Infrastructure Banks program, reauthorized under SAFETEA-LU, contains a similar expanded version of Davis Bacon as that in H.R. 720. As I stated earlier today, the expansion of Davis-Bacon is unprecedented for the SRF program.

Again, this unnecessary and wasteful provision requiring the application of prevailing wage rates to SRF projects will only slow the construction and limit the number of projects for much needed wastewater treatment plants in communities large and small across America.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,

Ranking Republican Member.

The practical effect of attempting to apply this Depression Era wage subsidy law and determining the prevailing wages for Federal construction projects is startling. The National School Boards Association found that more than 60 percent of its respondents confirmed that Davis-Bacon laws were responsible for increasing the cost of construction projects by over 20 percent.

This claim is backed up by Congress's own Congressional Budget Office, which issued a report in 2001 stating that repealing Davis-Bacon or raising the threshold for projects it covers "would allow appropriators to reduce funds spent on Federal construction."

The CBO has also estimated that if Congress were to repeal Davis-Bacon outright, it would save the Federal Government \$9.5 billion over the period between 2002 and 2011.

This Davis-Bacon expansion also tramples all over the rights of 18 States that have chosen not to have a State prevailing wage law because its associated inflated construction costs mean that limited State and local budgets cannot meet the priorities of their taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I will repeat that. Because its associated inflation construction costs mean that limited State and local budgets cannot meet the priorities of their taxpayers.

These States ought not to be saddled with this outdated Federal law against the will of their voters, which serves as an unfunded mandate by siphoning off scarce resources that would otherwise be spent on schools, hospitals, prisons, roads and other vital projects.

In the Rules Committee yesterday evening, we heard testimony from a number of our colleagues, particularly Dr. CHARLES BOUSTANY and RICHARD BAKER of Louisiana, who explained the practical impact of this legislation on their State, and might I add, a State that is in need of a lot of Federal money as a result of Katrina that occurred several years ago.

Quite simply, both Mr. BAKER and Mr. BOUSTANY made it very clear to the committee that today's legislation would have devastating effects on their State's ability to rebuild its clean water efforts and provide for much-needed environmental cleanup after the extremely costly devastation caused by Hurricanes Rita and Katrina.

Mr. Speaker, after last week, I am really not surprised by the lengths to which the Democrat leadership is willing to go to satisfy labor bosses. I am disappointed, however, by the targets that they are ready and willing to harm in accomplishing this narrow objective.

I ask every Member of this House to join with me in opposing this rule and the underlying legislation. The choice that we are being asked to make is very, very simple: If you support fiscal responsibility, small business, States' rights, rural communities, women- and minority-owned businesses, and the environment, you will join with me in opposing this rule.

If, however, instead, you support environmental harm, market distortion, wasteful Federal spending, and stacking the deck in favor of labor bosses, I wholeheartedly encourage you to vote for this legislation.

I do understand that the minority party may not be able to stop this rule from going forward, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to thank the Democrat leadership for putting this legislation and the crystal clear choice that it represents on the floor today so that voters are able to see what every single Member of this body supports.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague and I note that my colleague, unable to criticize the heart of this legislation, which is reauthorization of an important part of the Clean Water Act, instead reverts to attacking a portion of this legislation that is vital to workers across America, the Davis-Bacon provisions.

The Davis-Bacon Act prevents lower-cost out-of-State contractors from having an unfair ability to compete for local publicly funded construction, which protects local interests and construction workers.

Unfortunately, it has become all too familiar from the other side of the aisle to attack workers across America. They blocked the minimum wage until this new Congress was elected. We have a White House that has favored outsourcing of jobs over time.

But now, through this legislation, we are able to reaffirm again that it is our policy, in fact, it is Congress's longstanding continuing tradition of applying prevailing wage requirements to federally funded construction projects. Studies have shown that by attracting more experienced, better-trained workers, that wage requirements lead to higher productivity and they reduce overall costs, which offset any higher wages.

□ 0930

The Davis-Bacon Act protects communities by ensuring that wage determination also for individual counties is based solely on the local workforce costs. Oftentimes, this means that projects come in under budget and on time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her words, except I would like to let her know, I know she was not in the body last year, but this body did pass a minimum wage bill last year. It should be noted that the bill included exactly what the Democrat leadership wanted, and we took their bill exactly as it was for minimum wage. The problem that the Democrat leadership had was that it was a balanced approach, and that is the reason why it did not move forward in the other body and why the President never got it.

Mr. Speaker, what the Republicans did was to take the Democrat bill on minimum wage and add to that a balanced provision which would help small businesses who are bearing the burden of most of the brunt of the minimum wage and allow them the opportunity to offset those changes so that we can continue growing the free market economy. Small business is the engine of our economy.

It is also worth noting, since the gentlewoman brought it up, that this body this year did pass a minimum wage without those equalizing factors or benefits to small business, and that is why it got stuck in the other body and why this body is having to come back to correct it to make it a more balanced view, the same kind of balanced view that the Republicans took last year in order to pass the minimum wage.

I know the gentlewoman was not here last year, but those are the facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. He has been very eloquent on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I rise in opposition to this rule. I am deeply disappointed in the Rules Committee and its actions yesterday by limiting the number of amendments that we could have taken to the floor.

We all recognize that there is a gap, or a shortfall, in the funding that exists to help deal with our water infrastructure, and this is most pointedly affecting our small rural and disadvantaged communities; but I have to say the actions of the Rules Committee and the majority on the Rules Committee really disappoint me, because what we have seen now is politics trumping practical policy.

Sure, we don't agree on Davis-Bacon, and having an up-and-down vote is fine,

but that is a political vote. We are all frozen in our positions. But we could have taken a chance to protect our small and disadvantaged communities by creating some exemptions.

I had hoped to offer two amendments to this bill yesterday, and they were not ruled in order for the bill. One would have exempted small, disadvantaged communities as defined by law from Davis-Bacon big labor provisions in the bill. This would have given our small communities a chance to access these funds. What good are the funds if the communities can't get to them?

The gentlelady across the aisle here says, talk to local leaders. I can tell you, I have spoken to local leaders, Democrat and Republican alike, those who favor labor and those who don't, in my communities across my district, which is largely rural; and they have uniformly told me that these Davis-Bacon provisions and this State revolving loan fund will really put a burden on our small communities. It will inflate the costs by 20 to 25 percent.

So on the one hand we are saying, yes, let's create the revolving loan fund; let's fund it. On the other hand, we are telling our small communities, no, you can't have the money, because you can't afford it. You can't afford the match. You can't afford to access this money.

Our small and rural communities are the ones that are most often in need of adequate waste water infrastructure. I have visited every community in my district.

Mr. Speaker, this is a huge need, and I want to support this underlying bill; but we could have acted responsibly. We could have created exemptions that help our small and rural and disadvantaged communities. But, no, we have chosen to play politics instead of dealing with good, practical policy.

My amendments would have put the power back in the hands of local leaders. But, no, the Federal Government, the Federal Government is the one that has to dictate and mandate all. Once again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to empower Big Labor at the expense of small disadvantaged communities and local leaders.

I have to say I am deeply disappointed. There is plenty of evidence. The CBO, as my colleague mentioned earlier, has noted that repealing Davis-Bacon, raising the threshold for projects it covers, would allow appropriators to reduce Federal funds and therefore we could get more bang for the buck. The Department of Labor, after nearly 50 years, has not developed an effective program to issue and maintain current and accurate wage determinations. It may be impractical to ever do so. There are many problems with this. We could have acted responsibly, but, no, we have chosen to play politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule. We could have done better by the American public in put-

ting together a bill that would create the State revolving loan funds and allow our communities to access them. But, no, we have chosen to play politics.

I urge defeat of this rule and defeat of the underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee we had an opportunity to receive a number of amendments and have feedback from Members who were talking about these important water projects, and I found one amendment yesterday that was presented very interesting. It was rejected by the Democrats, but it says this:

"This amendment quadruples the current penalty for dumping sewage into the Great Lakes to \$100,000 per violation per day. The amendment also establishes a Great Lakes Clean-Up Fund within the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, and directs the sewage dumping penalties into this new fund to be spent on wastewater treatment options." Here is the interesting part: "These provisions would become effective January 1, 2027."

Mr. Speaker, a colleague brought forth an amendment as a result of a discussion with a major mayor of a city on the Great Lakes. I have heard all sorts of conversations about how important clean water is. Yet the Great Lakes, which is an area of about 20 million people that need this clean water, wake up today to find out that someone was willing to come forward with an idea which, even if enacted, doesn't take place until January 1, 2027.

No, we are not going to do that in the Rules Committee.

So on one side the Democrat majority talks about how great they are for all this clean water. But when it really comes down to it, still 20 million people are being denied this opportunity to start this clean water revolving fund and direct that sewage dumped into the Great Lakes would be cleaned up and have higher penalties. Utterly incredible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas for his leadership in this area and for yielding me some time to talk about this rule and a little more expansive subject.

I think what we are seeing today really demonstrates the difference between our side and our approach, the Republican approach to fiscal challenges, financial challenges, financial responsibility that we face in this Nation, and our friends on the majority side, on the Democrat side.

We have had some important bills this week that we have dealt with. We have also had an opportunity to be financially responsible, fiscally responsible and accountable to the American people. Our side has chosen to propose those measures of accountability. The

other side, the majority side, has chosen to ignore that. This is another example today.

I live outside of Atlanta. My district is the Sixth District of Georgia. It has remarkable challenges in the area of water and water quality. I appreciate the importance of assisting State and local governments in the area of clean water.

This is an important bill. It ought to be a priority of our Nation. What the majority party says, however, is that this may be a priority, but we are not going to treat it as a priority from a financial standpoint. We are going to throw money at it from a governmental standpoint and we are going to enact the kind of PAYGO proposal that the majority party loves so much, which is raise taxes and go on with the program. That is what this bill does.

This is an important bill. It authorizes \$16 billion in discretionary spending. It creates two new programs and continues other existing programs. There is \$375 million for the creation of new Federal grant programs at EPA and \$1.5 billion for State grant pollution control programs. It reauthorizes \$20 million annually for some expired pilot programs to provide technical assistance in the area of water works treatment projects, and it authorizes \$14 billion to provide grants to States to pay for the construction of clean water projects. These are important, important programs.

How do we pay for it? How do we pay for it? Well, the majority Democrat Party proposes that we pay for it by increased taxes, which is their "TAXGO" policy that they have for their financial programs. TAXGO: they raise taxes, and they raise taxes because they somehow believe that when you raise taxes on businesses that it never reaches the American people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you and I both know, corporations don't pay taxes. What they do is they cover that by charging more for their product. The American people pay corporate taxes. The American people's taxes, the American people's costs are increased when corporate taxes are increased. It is just like the other side, the majority side, believes that the money that comes to the Federal Government is the government's money. It is not the people's money; it is the government's money. And that is this clear definition that we have seen this week.

So I offered an amendment to this bill that said this ought to be a priority of our Nation. But we ought to state that it is a priority by saying that there are other measures in the Federal Government program that we ought not cover because this ought to take that priority. A true PAYGO, a true pay-as-you-go proposal.

The Rules Committee decided no, they didn't want to do it that way. They wanted to raise taxes on the American people. So their TAXGO policy is in full place right here with this rule that doesn't even allow, doesn't

even allow the Members of the House of Representatives to even make a statement on whether they think we ought to cover this with current money.

So the TAXGO policy is in place by our good friends on the majority side, on the Democrat side. This rule proves it. What has happened this week on the floor of the House proves it, as they have voted down real pay-as-you-go amendments to two of the previous bills.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I think this really points out the clear and distinct difference from a financial standpoint in this House of Representatives. I am told, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee doesn't even allow for a recorded vote anymore on these, so you can't even tell who is supportive of the rule and who isn't supportive of the rule. But as I understand it by those who were there, every single Democrat opposed my amendment, which means that every single Democrat, including the new Democrats on the Rules Committee, support a tax-and-go policy, a tax-and-spend policy.

This rule is a demonstration of that. This rule approves that. This rule proves that the majority party is not interested in financial responsibility and financial accountability, because they were given the opportunity to say, yes, we believe that we ought to identify priorities and pay for them at the Federal level by making certain that we are not increasing taxes and increasing the amount of money that hardworking Americans have to send to the Federal Government.

□ 0945

So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this rule. This is another evidence of the undemocratic side of the majority party that says, no, we ought not have a full and open debate which was promised to the American people. We ought not have a full and open debate on how we are going to pay for government programs.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be responsible, to be financially responsible, to allow for the appropriate discussion, debate and voting on measures so the American people know who their friends are from a taxing standpoint. I believe it is the Republican side of the aisle. I would hope my Democrat friends would join us in that endeavor, and urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and bring an appropriate rule, bring a rule that allows us to debate the issues in an open and honest way and then have the vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to notify the gentlewoman I will now yield myself the balance of my time, and then yield back my time and allow the gentlewoman to close.

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the statement of the administration policy on this bill.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, March 8, 2007.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 720—WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT OF 2007
(REP. OBERSTAR (D) MN AND 32 OTHERS)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 720, which authorizes excessive Federal funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) and mandates the application of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements "to the construction of treatment works carried out in whole or in part" with SRF funding. For the reasons described below, if H.R. 720 were presented to the President in its current form his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

The bill would expand Davis-Bacon Act coverage to a program that has not been subject to any Davis-Bacon requirements since 1994—first by reinstating coverage for Federally-funded clean water state revolving fund projects, and second by expanding Davis-Bacon Act coverage to non-Federal clean water projects, including for the first time ever, projects financed by funds contributed solely by States and moneys repaid to the state revolving fund. This provision will increase project costs and impose new administrative burdens on States. Furthermore, it is contrary to the Administration's long-standing policy of opposing any statutory attempt to expand or contract the applicability of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements.

In addition, the bill's total authorization of \$14 billion for the SRF during fiscal years 2008–2011 represents on average a more than 250 percent increase over recent appropriation levels and is unrealistic in the current fiscal environment. This excessive authorization will distort market signals by discouraging utilities and their consumers from moving toward full-cost pricing, as they have elsewhere. Instead, this bill may encourage municipalities to delay undertaking needed infrastructure projects to wait for Federal subsidies, potentially diminishing reliability and increasing the eventual costs to the public.

To provide additional opportunities to communities for financing needed wastewater infrastructure, Congress should enact the Administration's Water Enterprise Bond proposal, which would provide an exception to the unified annual State volume cap on tax-exempt qualified private activity bonds for wastewater and drinking water projects. To ensure the long-term financial health and solvency of these drinking water and wastewater systems, communities using these bonds must have demonstrated a process that will move toward full-cost pricing for services within five years of issuing the Private Activity Bonds. Consequently, this proposal will attract more private capital to meet the infrastructure needs of these sectors, help water and wastewater systems become self-financing, and minimize the need for future subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, part of what the President has said very clearly to Congress today is two things: number one, that this Davis-Bacon expansion will cost an incredible amount of money to local water districts that seek bonds and funding that go to the marketplace to get that money to match the Federal money; and that the President believes that by expanding Davis-Bacon arbitrarily, it will mean that the cost of all these projects will go up exponentially and make it far more difficult for local communities to get the funding they

need because it is more money than what should be paid reasonably for the projects to be done.

Secondly, the President makes a point which I think is very true, and that is by almost doubling the amount of money that is in this fund, America is now going to start looking to Washington to take care of these projects. Over my years in this body, we have seen over and over again the requests from the Democrats to let's go build more schools in this country—with Federal money. Oh, yes, with Davis-Bacon; but more importantly, it is a message to people back home, let's let Washington build our schools.

Republicans have said, the day we start doing that, there will be no more schools built by local people. Everybody will look to Washington.

The President is saying today, by this bill, people back home are going to start looking to Washington to take care of their water system needs. That is dangerous, and I think that is a problem.

Mr. Speaker, the choice that we are being asked to make is very clear. If you support fiscal responsibility, small business, States' right, rural communities, women- and minority-owned businesses and the environment, then you would want to oppose this rule and the underlying legislation.

However, I admit that the Democrats are going to win today, and we are going to lose; but instead, what that is going to mean is it is going to be environmental harm, market distortion, wasteful Federal spending and stacking the deck in favor of labor bosses. That is who is going to win today.

I include for the RECORD a letter to Speaker PELOSI and to the Republican leadership, JOHN BOEHNER, signed by the National Association of Minority Contractors, the National Association of Women in Construction, the National Alliance for Working and Employee Rights, and the Women Construction Owners and Executives who make very clear their opposition for the reasons why we have talked about today: Excessive overspending and far-reaching expansion of Davis-Bacon that will mean that many of these communities who need the money the most will find that on up to 20 percent of their projects, the needs of their people cannot be met because of bloated spending that is contained within this bill. We want to make it very clear that we oppose this legislation.

MARCH 7, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER BOEHNER: As the U.S. House of Representatives prepares to vote on the "Water Quality Financing Act of 2007", H.R. 720, we would like to recognize the important role of the federal government in addressing our nation's water infrastructure needs but strongly disagree with including egregious, prece-

dent-setting expansions of the federal Davis-Bacon Act to non-federal funds contained in the legislation.

In order to obtain the highest construction value for the taxpayers' dollar on these critical projects, it is imperative that this legislation not include any federal Davis-Bacon Act provisions. During past consideration of this legislation, debate has been crippled by harmful Davis-Bacon Act expansions and we implore you to let a clean bill, absent of Davis-Bacon provisions, pass through the U.S. House of Representatives in order to bring much needed water infrastructure to the American people.

We perceive any application of the Davis-Bacon Act into this legislation as expansion. Section 602(b)(6) of the Clean Water Act of 1987 clearly states that Davis-Bacon requirements on such loans were to sunset in FY 1995. Since October 1, 1994, the clean water state revolving funds have operated efficiently without Davis-Bacon requirements.

The Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO sued to impose Davis-Bacon on CWSRF after the sunset date. In a letter dated October 29, 1998, the EPA took issue with every argument made by the building trades. In fact, the EPA stated that even without section 513 in section 602(b)(6), the EPA "would reasonably have concluded that the CWA's Davis-Bacon Act provisions did not apply in the SRF program at all".

On June 22, 2000, the EPA, under the Clinton Administration, reversed its previous statements and issued a "settlement agreement" with organized labor to repeal the statutory sunset date of October 1, 1994, and expand Davis-Bacon to CWSRF for programs after July 1, 2001. Clearly, this "settlement agreement," which contradicted the earlier arguments made by the EPA itself, was a statutory violation of the Clean Water Act. If this legislation passes in current form it would undoubtedly be subject to litigation if enforced.

Given that Davis-Bacon requirements were sunset in 1995 and have not since applied, nor would such requirements apply unless expressly provided for by Congress, any re-application of Davis-Bacon to CWSRF would clearly be expansion of this flawed Act.

Lastly, a series of audits by outside agencies as well as the Department of Labor's (DOL) own Office of Inspector General (OIG) have revealed substantial inaccuracies in Davis-Bacon Act wage determinations and suggested that they are vulnerable to fraud. In addition, DOL's OIG released three reports highly critical of the wage determination program. In fact, one of the reports found one or more errors in 100 percent of the wage surveys they reviewed.

We, the undersigned organizations, are vehemently opposed to any re-application of Davis-Bacon requirements to this loan program and ask you to please vote against the "Water Quality Financing Act of 2007", H.R. 720, due to the harmful expansion of the Davis-Bacon Act contained within.

Respectfully submitted,

Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. (ABC); Chuck Muth, President, Citizen Outreach Project; Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Grover Norquist, Americans for Tax Reform (ATR); Independent Electrical Contractors, Inc. (IEC); Miller & Long Concrete Construction; National Association of Minority Contractors; National Association of Women in Construction; Tim Phillips, President, Americans for Prosperity; Ryan Ellis, Alliance for Worker Freedom; United States Chamber of Commerce; Will Fine, Executive Director, National Alliance for Worker and Employer Rights; Women Construction Owners and Executives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he wouldn't mind, prior to my closing, that we allow the distinguished gentleman from the Rules Committee to speak. He arrived as we were completing our dialogue, and I would like to yield him 2 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. I do recognize that from time to time as we do these rules that people do come down. The gentleman who is asking to speak is a member of the Rules Committee, and based upon that request, I consent and agree, and I welcome the gentleman.

Ms. CASTOR. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for his courtesy and also thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership on the Rules Committee and for her spectacular handling of this rule today before us. I appreciate all of her insights and advocacy on behalf of clean water and environmental issues. I want to make clear for the record that this entire House should be grateful for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. It is a fair rule. There are three Democratic amendments and three Republican amendments. They cover the many issues brought before the Rules Committee last night.

I want to take a moment to address one issue, and that is the issue of Davis-Bacon. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) said that the Democrats are going to win and the Republicans are going to lose on this vote. Well, let me say I would recharacterize it. I think the American people and the American workers are going to win if we keep the Davis-Bacon provisions.

I know many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't like Davis-Bacon and who don't believe that people should be paid the prevailing wage, who don't believe that the workers of this country should be paid a livable wage.

Well, the majority in this Congress today believes the opposite. I bet many people on the gentleman's side of the aisle believe as well. Workers in this country are working longer hours and harder than ever before, and they can't make ends meet. We shouldn't have a rush to the bottom when it comes to the wages of the workers in this country. We need to stand firm and stand tall for the workers of this country to ensure that they get paid a livable wage so they can support their families, so they have health care and pension benefits. That is what this debate is about.

So, today, my colleagues who don't like Davis-Bacon will have a choice.

They have an amendment in order that can rip Davis-Bacon out of this bill. They can eliminate Davis-Bacon. They can eliminate the prevailing wage. They can eliminate a livable wage for workers. Or you can stand with the majority in this Congress for workers, for the prevailing wage, for Davis-Bacon, for a livable wage; and that is the right thing to do.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Would the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim 2 minutes of my time as a result of us yielding back our time because we did not anticipate any additional speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the distinguished gentleman from the Rules Committee: Yes, it is political with regard to Davis-Bacon, strip it or leave it, but what about exemptions? Why couldn't we entertain exemptions for small, disadvantaged communities? What is the fear on your side in not allowing that to come to a floor debate?

I simply ask the question, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

It is this gentleman's opinion that what the gentleman is trying to do is to chip away at Davis-Bacon, chip away at workers' rights and chip away at the prevailing wage and chip away at making sure that workers get a livable wage, and this gentleman is very much opposed to that.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Reclaiming my time, I would say that if small, disadvantaged communities cannot access the funds to repair their infrastructure, it is going to hurt the worker, and it is going to hurt the disadvantaged small community.

I would say there is a practical way to move through this with regard to policy rather than simply playing politics.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we think we are trying to make a point here today that there were some strong reservations that should have been taken into account by the Rules Committee. We are not trying to chip away at minimum wage. We tried last year to pass a new minimum wage.

What we are trying to do is get work done that is in the best interest of not only Americans who need these projects to complete things that have been done to their communities as a result of damage but also to move forward with more efficiency.

We support spending money for clean water. We don't support bloated

projects that are against the market-based abilities that communities have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we don't delay any longer and that we take action on this rule and this legislation that reauthorizes an important part of the Clean Water Act.

I understand where some of the debate is going to occur today, and I understand that a sizable number of Members on the other side of the aisle oppose the Davis-Bacon requirements for fair wages across the country. But the Rules Committee has made in order an amendment on Davis-Bacon, and Members in this body will have an opportunity to debate and vote on that issue. It is important, however, as we enter that debate, that we recognize that Davis-Bacon ensures a higher-quality work product and ensures that the work is done right the first time as higher-paid workers are the best trained and most experienced.

I urge Members to defeat that amendment and continue in the new direction that is being charted by this new Democratic Congress where we stand up for the hard-working men and women across this great country.

It is too important to delay any longer this reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. It is imperative that Congress now pass the Water Quality Financing Act, H.R. 720, which will provide critically needed funds for clean water infrastructure. It will protect the public health, the environment and our quality of life. It will restore the viability of the Federal, State and local partnership to meet the goals of the Clean Water Act. And ultimately, if we take action today, we will protect and improve the health of our citizens across America.

I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 179, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—229

Abercrombie
Ackerman

Aderholt
Allen

Altmire
Andrews

Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)

Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey

Oliver
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—179

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Blibray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan

Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent

Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Gerlach | Lungren, Daniel | Rogers (MI) |
| Gilchrest | E. | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Gillmor | Mack | Roskam |
| Gingrey | Manzullo | Royce |
| Gohmert | McCarthy (CA) | Ryan (WI) |
| Goode | McCaul (TX) | Sali |
| Goodlatte | McCotter | Saxton |
| Granger | McCrery | Schmidt |
| Graves | McHenry | Sensenbrenner |
| Hall (TX) | McHugh | Sessions |
| Hastert | McKeon | Shadeeg |
| Hastings (WA) | McMorris | Shays |
| Hayes | Rodgers | Shimkus |
| Heller | Melancon | Shuster |
| Hensarling | Mica | Simpson |
| Herger | Miller (FL) | Smith (NE) |
| Hobson | Miller (MI) | Smith (TX) |
| Hoekstra | Miller, Gary | Stearns |
| Hulshof | Moran (KS) | Sullivan |
| Inglis (SC) | Musgrave | Tancredo |
| Issa | Myrick | Terry |
| Jindal | Pence | Thornberry |
| Johnson, Sam | Peterson (PA) | Petri |
| Jones (NC) | Petri | Tiahrt |
| Jordan | Pickering | Tiberi |
| Keller | Pitts | Turner |
| King (IA) | Poe | Upton |
| King (NY) | Porter | Walberg |
| Kingston | Price (GA) | Walden (OR) |
| Kirk | Pryce (OH) | Walsh (NY) |
| Knollenberg | Putnam | Wamp |
| Kuhl (NY) | Radanovich | Weldon (FL) |
| Lamborn | Ramstad | Weller |
| Latham | Regula | Westmoreland |
| LaTourette | Rehberg | Wicker |
| Lewis (CA) | Reichert | Wilson (NM) |
| Lewis (KY) | Renzi | Wilson (SC) |
| Linder | Reynolds | Wolf |
| LoBlando | Rogers (AL) | Young (FL) |
| Lucas | Rogers (KY) | |

NOT VOTING—25

| | | |
|---------------|-------------|------------|
| Bachus | Eshoo | Neugebauer |
| Bono | Fattah | Nunes |
| Boren | Hunter | Ortiz |
| Boswell | Kline (MN) | Paul |
| Calvert | Larson (CT) | Pearce |
| Camp (MI) | Marchant | Souder |
| Cardoza | Millender | Whitfield |
| Davis, Jo Ann | McDonald | Young (AK) |
| Engel | Moore (WI) | |

□ 1037

Mr. GRAVES changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, DELAHUNT, ADERHOLT, and TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 132, I was on a visit to Walter Reed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT
OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 229 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on

the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 720.

□ 1037

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 720) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes, with Ms. SOLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself 4½ minutes and rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

It has been a long time coming to this point. We have labored within the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for at least 11 years, maybe just a few months longer than that, to bring forth a bill to replenish the State revolving loan funds so that municipalities can continue the work of aggressively expanding their capacity to handle wastewater, treat that wastewater, return it to the receiving waters in good quality.

We have been delayed over the last 6 Congresses, not by unwillingness within our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, but because of external factors within the House. Now that those external factors have been removed, we are bringing this bill to the floor with good and sustained bipartisan support. I appreciate very much the support of Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER scheduling this legislation early on in the session; and I particularly appreciate the participation and cooperation of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), our ranking member, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources for the long participation that we have had and the splendid agreement and working relationship we had between our staffs on the Democratic and Republican sides, with one notable exception that will be debated at length here and which we debated extensively in subcommittee and full committee.

I especially want to express my great appreciation to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON). For years now, she has worked as our ranking member on the Water Resources Subcommittee, learned the issues, mastered the subject matter, and is now Chair of the Water Resources Subcommittee and has played a leading role in bringing this legislation to the floor.

The bill started out as \$20 billion to replenish State revolving loan funds; but due to concerns by the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office, we scaled the legislation back to a \$14 billion bill, paying for it through an additional revenue source, as within the authority of this committee. The CBO has said that municipalities in raising municipal bonds that are tax exempt will cause a loss in revenue to the Treasury, and, therefore, the revenue in this bill has to be offset by another source. We have done that in a bipartisan agreement, and this bill is at \$14 billion, fully paid for. We will not have the debate that we have had on two other bills that were extraneous to the subject matter because we have covered this issue.

Unfortunately, the administration has steadily reduced funding for the State revolving loan fund over the past several years, and in the budget request for 2008 has a \$200 million reduction, down to \$687.5 million. That is totally unacceptable.

There was a time when we were investing \$6 billion a year in Federal funds, matched by State and local dollars, to build sewage treatment facilities, raise them to tertiary treatment, removing nutrients, adding oxygen, returning clean water to the receiving waters. We are not doing that any longer. We are not keeping pace with the pressure on the Nation's water and wastewater systems nor our sewage treatment systems.

The only debate that we really have is, What shall be the wages paid to those who work on building these facilities? And I listened with great interest and concern to the debate on the rule. The manager of the rule said that cities will start looking to Washington for these projects to take care of their water system needs. That is almost the same language that Dwight Eisenhower used in 1960 to veto the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments when he said: Pollution is a uniquely local blight. Federal involvement will only impede local efforts at cleanup.

That was wrong then, it is wrong now, it was wrong when Richard Nixon vetoed the Clean Water Act of 1972.

We have had a partnership of State and local government. They have invested billions of dollars at the local level. We need to continue that partnership into the future. This bill will do that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, at this time I would yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of this Committee on Transportation, Mr. MICA.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairwoman and Members of the House, normally I would be supportive of this legislation. I have tried to work in a bipartisan manner with Mr. OBERSTAR and other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle.

The underlying bill is basically a good bill. It does provide funding assistance to State revolving funds. However, the bill as reported out of the committee, I voted against it. I will vote against it again if it contains a Davis-Bacon provision. We will have an opportunity with an amendment offered by Mr. BAKER and Mr. KING that would repeal the provision that is put in the bill as it came from the committee.

Currently, 18 States have no prevailing wage law. My State, Florida, and 17 other States will be dramatically impacted. And, actually, what will happen is the opposite of what we will want to have happen: instead of having more money, we will have less money for these important projects.

This is an unprecedented expansion of Davis-Bacon requirements as they relate to the Clean Water Act. In fact, this is a mandate, and I call it "The Mother of All Unfunded Mandates," which is in fact sort of an earmark to Big Labor interests and a payback to Big Labor. It is unfortunate that, again, those that will suffer are the States and local governments and the intent of this legislation, which is to provide wastewater funds.

And, finally, I hate to say it, but I have a statement from the administration. The President will veto the legislation if it contains the Davis-Bacon provisions.

So I urge Members to support an amendment by Mr. BAKER and Mr. KING to strike that language from this legislation, and let's pass legislation without this onerous provision.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, the Chair of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

□ 1045

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, thanks to the chairman of our committee.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

This essential legislation reauthorizes the Federal grant program for capitalizing State revolving funds at \$14 billion over the next 4 years, while providing States with additional flexibility in the types of projects they finance.

The bill also provides States with increased flexibility in the financing packages they can offer to cities and local communities, including principal forgiveness, negative interest loans, or whatever other financing mechanism might be necessary to assist communities in meeting their water quality infrastructure goals.

The flexibility afforded by this bill will go a long way in helping many of our communities that are least able to afford necessary improvements to their water infrastructure systems.

This legislation also encourages communities to consider innovative and al-

ternative technologies for addressing ongoing water quality concerns, including the so-called "green infrastructure," and provides financial incentives for implementing these technologies that may result in greater long-term environmental benefits.

In my State, few Federal programs have proven as effective as the Texas Clean Water State Revolving Fund program in realizing congressional goals for all citizens. The key to its success has been the partnership between the Texas and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency working together in blending State and Federal resources to provide sustainable funding sources.

This funding source provides a significant financial incentive for communities to construct, rehabilitate, and enhance wastewater systems that support the goals of the Clean Water Act.

Since its inception in 1987, the State revolving fund has successfully awarded communities approximately \$4.3 billion in low-interest loans to finance 472 water infrastructure projects across the State.

These projects, which serve approximately one-half of the Texas population and treat about 2.1 billion gallons per day of wastewater, provide direct environmental and public health benefits by protecting our water resources through the reduction of pollutants entering the water.

The projects are made economically viable because Texas customers realize a direct cost savings by assessing the State revolving funds at rates below market rates.

Madam Chairman, it has been 20 years since Congress last authorized appropriations for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, and almost 10 years since the Committee on Transportation Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources first investigated the growing need for it.

Fortunately, we have overcome one hurdle that has prevented this legislation from coming to the floor over the past 8 years, and I applaud the leadership of the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. OBERSTAR, as well as the committee staff for their good works in moving this legislation out of Committee and on to the House floor.

Now, Madam Chairman, it is past time for this Congress to complete its task in sending this legislation to the President.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support this legislation; it's time we make our domestic infrastructure programs a priority again.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, at this time I claim 2 minutes.

Madam Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the gentlelady and to the Chair for their diligent work in this area. Certainly, it is an arena in which there is a clear and established, well identified need for which there are too few resources available. It is also a problem which will require many, many years of dedicated work to ensure the delivery of a safe water infrastructure in the years ahead.

I, regretfully, have observed that the debate which will occur over the estab-

lishment of Davis-Bacon in this legislation is the one point around which great controversy has emerged.

In my own State, I can speak with authority as to our circumstance. Pursuant to the devastation of Katrina and Rita, we find our communities struggling to get back on their feet, and our infrastructure has been badly damaged. Water systems, pumping stations, sewage systems have been destroyed; and it will take, unfortunately, years for many communities to attain the status that they once had prior to the storms' impact.

It is clear to us that, although the American people and this Congress have been very generous to our State in making resources available, those resources are going to be stretched to their maximum extent possible; and yet we still have incredible needs that will yet be unmet. For this reason, we feel, at least in the view of our own State's interest, that the application of the Davis-Bacon requirement, artificially increasing the cost of construction of these important infrastructure projects, will only ensure that we are years longer in achieving the necessary recovery.

To state it quite simply, to spend more and accomplish less is not something we in Louisiana are comfortable in pursuing. For that reason, I join with my ranking Member, Mr. MICA, in expressing grave concerns over the inclusion of Davis-Bacon.

In the normal operative circumstance, when funds are made available from the State revolving account to a State for a particular project, Davis-Bacon has applied to that first-round funding. This bill will now make Davis-Bacon provisions extend to all subsequent utilizations of those funds, and that is the expansion to which we strongly object.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, the chairman of the committee, who has done such an extraordinary job for decades now in taking care of the environment and particularly providing for clean water and sewer treatment for our country, so critical to our public health and to the health of our country.

I want to, at the outset, however, make an observation, that I am not surprised, very frankly, I tell my friends on the other side of the aisle, that they are concerned about Davis-Bacon provisions in this bill. After all, of course, most of those who have risen voted against raising the minimum wage in this country from \$5.15 to \$7.25 over a 2½-year period.

If you don't believe in raising the minimum wage from \$5.15, it is not surprising to me that you are not for paying a prevailing wage to workers on public projects.

I have observed in the past, of course, how much cheaper projects would be if we didn't pay our laborers at all, and we just forced them to work. But hopefully we will not pursue, ever, a policy like that.

I want to commend the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota, for all of his hard work and leadership on this important legislation reauthorizing the Clean Water State Revolving Fund for the first time in 13 years.

It is interesting that our friends on this side of the aisle have been in charge of this Congress and bringing legislation to the floor for the last 12 years. So since they took charge, they have not reauthorized this program; again, not because of the observations, as has been pointed out, they didn't think we needed to have a clean water program, but because they didn't want to pay prevailing wages.

I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for his leadership, and I want to thank my dear friend, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for her very important leadership as well.

As you know, we have passed two other bills this week reauthorizing sewer overflow control grants, H.R. 569 and H.R. 700, related to combined sewer overflow grants to States for aging sewers. We know that is a problem throughout this country. That handles storm water and sewage water, and H.R. 700, which is a pilot project for getting clean water to rural communities. We know that we focus on urban communities, but it is very important for us to also make sure that our rural communities have clean water.

I believe that this bill, as has been indicated, has bipartisan support, notwithstanding the difference on prevailing wage.

Madam Chairman, the fact is a clean safe water supply is vital in communities, both large and small, rural and urban, all across this Nation. We are not talking about a luxury, a perk or a non-necessity. Clean water, safe water is absolutely indispensable to the good health of all Americans, as well as our way of life and our continued prosperity.

Just consider, my colleagues, that our Nation's farmers and fishermen and manufacturing and tourism industries rely on a clean water supply, and their activities contribute hundreds of billions of dollars to our economy every year.

Our Nation, as has been pointed out, now faces a clean water crisis. As the Environmental Protection Agency warned in a recent report, and I am quoting from the administration's Environmental Protection Agency: "Without continued improvements in wastewater treatment infrastructure, future population growth will erode away many of the Clean Water Act achievements."

And I want to congratulate Mr. BAKER and Mr. OBERSTAR for their

leadership in trying to confront that crisis. One key reason for the clean water crisis is that much of the water infrastructure in our Nation is rapidly approaching or already exceeding its projected life.

So I am proud today, Madam Chairman, that the new House majority, with the support of many Republicans, will take an important step toward addressing our Nation's water needs by reauthorizing the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and authorizing \$14 billion over the next 4 years to ensure safe water for our families and for our people. And I congratulate both sides of the aisle for working towards that objective.

The fund is the primary source of Federal funding for clean water, helping to provide low-interest loans to local communities for construction of wastewater treatment facilities and other water pollution abatement projects.

In fact, since 1987, when the fund became the major Federal source of clean-water funding, it has provided States with more than \$50 billion for more than 18,600 low-interest loans to local communities.

The unfortunate truth is, the recent Congresses allowed the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to expire in 1994 and failed to reauthorize it because, as I have said, and as we have seen on the floor, the concern about Davis-Bacon, the concern about paying a prevailing wage, wages that I think are fair and appropriate for public projects.

In recent years, the former majority cut funding for the funds involved in this project by 34 percent, and the President has proposed cutting it even further.

Madam Chairman, it is a new day in this, the people's House. It is long past time for us to act on this important legislation.

The new House majority is absolutely committed, under the leadership of JIM OBERSTAR, who has been one of the giants on this issue, for, as I said, decades, not days, not weeks, not months, not years, but decades he has been in the leadership of this effort.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in a bipartisan way, to reauthorize this critically important piece of legislation.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, at this time I would like to extend to the gentleman from Florida, a valued member of the Committee on Transportation, the Honorable Congressman CONNIE MACK, 2 minutes.

Mr. MACK. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time, and I also want to say that I appreciate the way the committee has worked on a very important issue.

I think all of us understand and recognize that the Clean Water State Revolving Fund is so important to all of our communities. And let's face it, we work for the people back home.

But it is concerning to me that when you have such a positive piece of legis-

lation that can have such a tremendous effect on people's lives back in our districts, that you would add the Davis-Bacon requirements into this.

A few minutes ago we heard from the majority leader that he finds it strange that over here you will have people voting against a minimum wage, and then voting against Davis-Bacon.

Well, it is kind of simple. We believe that, or at least I believe, that competition, the free market, should dictate these projects, not government; that government shouldn't be coming in saying this is how much you are going to pay your employees, or this is how much you are going to have to pay for projects.

And including the Davis-Bacon requirements into this only puts, it makes it so that States like mine have a hard time voting for a piece of legislation that will add, will bring the cost of the construction projects up.

At a time when our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about being fiscally responsible, what they are really committed to, as we heard earlier, their commitment is to raising taxes and spending more money.

□ 1100

I would like to see us, in the future, when we have such a good piece of legislation, one that almost everyone can support, that we do not get in the habit that it appears to be now of payback of some sort to labor and to the unions. It just isn't right. The American people deserve better.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

We are talking about a Federal mandate here. It is good policy. We need to protect our critical clean water resources. But this is a Federal mandate put on our local communities.

The Republicans, for 12 years, have failed to reauthorize this law and have consistently cut funding to our communities in the face of this unfunded Federal mandate. The backlog has grown from \$300 to \$500 billion over the next 20 years to maintain, rehab and, yes, do some new construction for population growth.

We have here a very aptly named "SAP" from the White House. The White House says \$14 billion is excessive. Let's see, that is about 3 to 5 percent of the demonstrated need in this unfunded mandate on our communities, and the White House says, 3 to 5 percent, that's excessive. And then they go on with this ideological claptrap: "It will distort market signals by discouraging utilities and their consumers from moving toward full cost pricing, and they will delay undertaking projects." My community is under consent agreements under law, under Federal law to do this. They can't delay. What a bunch of claptrap. They are trying to take care of Wall

Street here and not Main Street. Wall Street wants to be able to issue these bonds in the private sector. They don't want the government to help these communities. They can make a little bit of commission there.

And they want to drive down the wages of the workers. Why do you hate the middle class so much? Why don't you think people should earn a living wage? What claptrap. "The market should set wages altogether. We shouldn't have a minimum wage." Come on, what planet are you people from? Who do you represent? Do you represent the special interests, or do you represent average and working families in this country?

Look at the communities in my district. Coburg, a thousand people; \$95 debt retirement, plus user fees. Not exactly a wealthy community. Sweet Home, 7,500 people, a depressed timber community in the mountains, \$220 a month if they don't get some help for their fees. Gardner, 340 people on the coast; \$2.5 million for 340 people. And the White House says helping them would be excessive and it would distort the market.

Why do you hate the middle class and our communities so much? And guess what, businesses are going to suffer, too, if we don't make this investment.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, at this time, I would yield 2 minutes to the defender of the working man and hometown America, Congressman TIM MURPHY.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This week the House passed a number of bills which are important to my municipality in the 18th Congressional District in Pennsylvania. This Water Quality Financing Act, which will authorize \$20 billion over the next 5 years for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, is an important bill. It offers increased flexibility for local communities to meet their water quality infrastructure goals.

We take for granted the quality of our water, but it was not always so. The life expectancy of Americans increased from age 47 in the early 1900's to a life expectancy of 75 by the end of the century. The number one reason was the public health benefits of clean water and efficient sewer systems.

Decades ago, Southwestern Pennsylvania's boroughs and townships built their sewer lines with combined sanitary and storm water in the same system. What made sense at the time is now an antiquated and overburdened system. Wherever there is significant rain, it leaves untreated sewage flowing into our rivers and streams, recreating a health hazard.

The EPA then mandated the communities must fix these problems, but now local communities are strapped with massive costs. In Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, alone repair costs exceed \$3 billion. The towns then pass on the cost to homeowners. Many citizens are seniors on fixed incomes who simply

cannot afford to fix the mistakes of the past and still pay for their bills today. Without funding, many of my towns just can't make it.

For years we have tried to help by providing annual funding assistance in a piecemeal manner. We need a comprehensive plan to provide a steady stream of funds to fix these problems, meet the standards to clean up our streams, support the public health and not pass on the whole burden of the inherited problem to current homeowners.

After working on this problem for years, both sides of the aisle have worked on this problem for years. I am pleased that we have some opportunities to offer some solutions; the solutions that I recognize are going to require some more crafting with the House and Senate.

I commend my colleagues who are going to work on this to recognize that we all need to work together because we are all concerned about working men and women. We are all concerned about people, without assigning them to any classes, and together we will work to solve these health problems of our water infrastructure in America.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, an original cosponsor of this bill, Mrs. TAUSCHER.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Chair, I want to thank the chairman and Subcommittee Chairwoman JOHNSON for the opportunity to speak, and for their leadership in support of the Water Quality Financing Act. And as has been said, this legislation will provide \$14 billion to deserving communities and water agencies.

The State Revolving Fund continues to be one of the most efficient and practical Federal funding programs for water reconstruction and infrastructure projects in local communities.

I have been a long supporter of reauthorizing the Clean Water SRF and infusing much-needed funding into our Nation's clean water infrastructure. In the last four Congresses, I have joined with my colleague, former Congresswoman Sue Kelly, to offer legislation to reauthorize the SRF program. Unfortunately, the Republican-controlled Congress never acted on this important legislation.

Today's legislation finally gives us the opportunity to do the right thing. It is imperative that Congress continues our partnership with communities to fund Federal clean water mandates in the most cost efficient manner possible. As a loan fund and not a grant program, the Clean Water SRF promotes fiscal responsibility without denying communities the opportunity to refurbish, rehabilitate or rebuild new water infrastructure. Whether used for funding wastewater treatment or non-point source pollution control, the SRF is a useful tool in providing cleaner, safer water in our communities.

The EPA has identified billions of dollars in water infrastructure needs.

It's time that we act responsibly and reauthorize this important program. As stewards of the Clean Water Act, we have the responsibility to provide for infrastructure necessary to ensure its proper implementation. Today's legislation gets us back on track.

Madam Chair, there will be much discussion about the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage language in this bill. In my view, the verdict is in. Protecting Davis-Bacon and the prevailing wage laws it supports are a national priority. This is evidenced by over half the States, including mine, California, passing their own prevailing wage laws. And importantly, Madam Chairman, it is clear a majority of the House supports Davis-Bacon.

I look forward to joining a bipartisan majority of the House today in taking a strong stand and rejecting any attempt to limit the application of Davis-Bacon protections.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 720.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to a gentleman who is a defender of the taxpayer's best interest, Congressman PENCE.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

Today the House is considering the Water Quality Financing Act introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota. And I wish to commend him for his ongoing leadership in this area of the law and the infrastructure needs of the American people.

The bill does do many good and important things, and I believe it is well intended. But I want to urge my colleagues to oppose this bill because I have great concerns about the cost, but also, most especially, about the expansion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirement to construction projects funded under this bill.

H.R. 720 authorizes \$16 billion in discretionary spending over 5 years, new programs that contain a significant expansion of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. And therein applies the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage law.

Since 1995, the Davis-Bacon requirement was not applied to construction projects funded through these revolving funds; however, this bill would reinstitute this requirement. Many of the primary taxpayer watchdog organizations in America are opposing this bill on this basis alone, National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, just to name a few.

The Davis-Bacon law was signed into law in 1931 during the Great Depression in order to inflate labor rates for workers on government projects. But, Madam Chair, the Great Depression is over and the time for expanding the prevailing wage for projects like these is gone. An honest day's work should be met with an honest day's pay, not an artificial government-mandated

wage rate. Let's say yes to the sacred right of contract. Let's say yes to the best deal for the American people on public projects. Let's say no to the expansion of Davis-Bacon and to the projects under this legislation. I urge a "no" vote among my colleagues for that reason.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield myself 10 seconds to simply assure the gentleman from Indiana that the bill is fully paid for. And I appreciate his fiscal concerns, but the bill is fully paid for with offsets that the committee has identified and has reduced the cost of the bill from \$20 billion to \$14 billion and the time frame from 5 years to 4 years. And I appreciate the gentleman's kind words about my service.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And congratulations on a well thought of, well put forth piece of legislation, and I strongly support this legislation.

I want to address the Davis-Bacon issue I have heard so much about in the last few days. I represent one of the more rural, disadvantaged districts, and we should not be taking away Davis-Bacon. To take away Davis-Bacon because a district is small or rural or may be considered disadvantaged as some people say is just purely hogwash. Davis-Bacon is good for rural America. Davis-Bacon is good for urban America. Davis-Bacon is good for all Americans.

In my congressional district, which is comprised of mostly seniors and veterans and households with income around \$38,000, my district can't afford not to have Davis-Bacon. My district needs to keep wages up, not lower our wages. There should be no retreat, no surrender on Davis-Bacon. We should stop this madness. We come here, and it is always like a race to the bottom: Who can do it for cheaper? Who can do it for lower? Who are we affecting? The men and women who I represent and all the men and women who built this country. We should pay them a decent wage so they can afford a decent standard of living. Take health care. If you are going to try and do health care in this country, you better have \$48,000 a year minimum income because the insurance premiums are \$12,000 to \$14,000. Davis-Bacon allows you a fair wage so you can afford health insurance so you can provide for your family.

When we take a look at this, Davis-Bacon provides nothing more than quality work for decent pay. We have got to stop the race to the bottom, do not drive down wages. There should be no retreat, no surrender. Support Davis-Bacon. Support this bill, H.R. 720. I compliment the chairman; it is a great piece of legislation.

I have been here now for a while. We are finally going to put money back into the water system, to our wastewater treatment systems to clean up our environment, to clean up public

health so our people can have a safe quality of life, but they can't do it without an adequate income. Support this legislation. Reject the Baker-King shallow argument about rural America needs a special exception in order to afford it. Rural America supports this legislation. We cannot afford to walk away from Davis-Bacon. We must have Davis-Bacon in this legislation.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to Congressman KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding, and for his leadership and his hard and diligent work in committee.

I also compliment the chairman from Minnesota who has a gracious approach to this and generally a reasonable approach to this issue. But this Davis-Bacon issue is something where I meet a philosophical divide. I don't know if there is another Member of this Congress who has live lived under Davis-Bacon, earned Davis-Bacon wages and paid Davis-Bacon wages, but I can tell you I am one who has done both. And it goes back through 28 years of the construction business; 1,400 and some consecutive weeks of tracking wages and paying the thing called "prevailing wage" and knowing prevailing wage is not prevailing wage. It is always union scale. And the reason for that is because no one reports the prevailing wage for fear they will be organized to be become a union and they will have to pay a union scale.

I have difficulty with this because I hire my people year round. We make sure that they get a good living wage for the full year. We provide health insurance. We provide retirement benefits. And when you pay people a union scale, then you can only plug them on a machine for the hours of running that machine. You can't afford to have them grease it or haul it or fix it.

□ 1115

So I know employers that will work 16 hours a day in order to keep the machines supported so their union scale man can climb in the seat of it. This is a distortion of the free enterprise system.

I will argue also that this bill has an earmark in it, and this earmark is the mark called Davis-Bacon wages. Now, earmarks go back to when a pig is born you notch his ear so you can track his genetics through the marketing system. Well, this is an earmark into the first generation of money that goes into the revolving fund. Then once that money is in there, it comes back around again and again with a Davis-Bacon earmark in it, and I know Midwesterners really appreciate this argument, but the next generation of pigs, you at least got to earmark him when he is born.

This one automatically earmarks every generation of money that rolls through this revolving fund now until the end of perpetuity, and that, Madam Chairman, is a bridge too far. We are

not just labeling this Davis-Bacon wage scale. It is Davis-Bacon wage scale in perpetuity.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act.

In my home of St. Louis, we have one of the oldest wastewater infrastructure systems in the Nation, some dating back to the Civil War. Our crumbling and overused sewer systems are an environmental and economic burden and they frequently threaten the health of the Mississippi River, one of our national treasures. During heavy rain storms, as many as 200 sewers can overflow.

H.R. 720 reaffirms our commitment to continue the progress of the 1972 Clean Water Act and ensures that generations to come will enjoy clean and safe water supplies.

By including Davis-Bacon protections in this bill, our communities will be further assisted by ensuring that our constituents who build these projects will be paid no less than prevailing wage. At a time when thousands of jobs are outsourced from our communities, these Davis-Bacon protections serve as a strong example of homesourcing. Instead of allowing outsiders to undercut the wages of our constituents, Davis-Bacon keeps these fair wages in our communities.

I commend Chair OBERSTAR and Chairwoman JOHNSON for their leadership and look forward to passing this bill in a bipartisan way.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill because of an abundantly flawed provision it contains. As the ranking member on the committee with jurisdiction over the Davis-Bacon Act, I am particularly concerned about the Davis-Bacon mandate in the bill before us today. I have these two basic concerns for two basic reasons: they represent both bad policy and bad process.

First on process: the Education and Labor Committee, again, the committee with jurisdiction over Davis-Bacon, never formally considered the bill's Davis-Bacon provision, not in a hearing, not in a markup, not in any procedure whatsoever. Rather, a simple exchange of letters with the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee rendered our committee colleagues powerless to weigh the impact of these provisions on the projects themselves, on local economies, and, indeed, on the American taxpayers.

The fact that Davis-Bacon wages rates have not applied to projects funded through the Clean Water Revolving Fund since 1995, a decision made by the

Clinton administration I might add, demonstrates that the change before us is not a small one and it is certainly not one that should be made without appropriate consideration by the committee of jurisdiction.

The second reason for my opposition to the provisions is much more basic. It is just bad policy. By inflating labor rates, Davis-Bacon typically increases the costs of Federal projects by anywhere from 5 to 38 percent. And who ends up paying for all this? That is right, the American taxpayers.

Furthermore, the costs of Davis-Bacon are particularly burdensome for small businesses. Literally, this mandate can saddle private companies with millions of dollars of excess administrative work every year, and because of economies of scale, small, locally owned businesses rarely if ever have the resources to comply with this Federal mandate. As a result, large companies are more often awarded government contracts, even for small projects.

Federal law should not have a built-in bias against small businesses, and I believe this assertion is reflected by President Bush's veto threat.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure because it is bad policy and bad process.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN).

Mr. KAGEN. Madam Chairman, I support H.R. 720 because it will renew our commitment to a positive change in a new direction by investing in our Nation's substantial water infrastructure needs. To me, it is all about our health. It is about clean water and the success of our economy.

As a physician, I am particularly concerned with the health risks directly related to contaminated drinking water and am pleased this Congress understands the need to invest in wastewater infrastructure needs. The EPA predicts that without significant investment and upgrades in our water pollution system, this pollution will continue excessively. By investing in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, we will ensure the communities receive the financing they require for their wastewater treatment projects.

In northeast Wisconsin, the Clean Water Fund program has helped Brown and Outagamie Counties invest and develop and rehabilitate wastewater and sewer treatment plants. The projects funded in my district alone are indicative of the demand across the Nation for this bill. By encouraging long-term planning for our Nation's clean water infrastructure, we will reduce overall maintenance costs and create more sustainable systems, even as we create higher-wage jobs back home in Wisconsin where they belong.

Finally, I am particularly pleased the Davis-Bacon Act requirements provision will prevail and that the wages of Davis-Bacon will be upheld and local prevailing wages will take place.

This bill will be great for our health, our economy, and our environment. I encourage all of us on both sides of the aisle to vote "yea."

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me that time.

I just wanted to clear up a couple of statements that have been made and misconceptions that have been made.

First of all, from the other side, we did hear that this in fact is a Federal mandate, and I did refer in my opening remarks that this is in fact the mother of all unfunded mandates, because it does in an unprecedented fashion with the Davis-Bacon provision that is included in this bill expand the provisions of Davis-Bacon in, again, a fashion that has never been done before in this program. Mr. KING spoke a little bit about this.

I think we all ought to clean up our water and have the best wastewater treatment possible. We do want to fund this program, but we want to do it in a responsible fashion.

But, again, what is unprecedented here, and the Members of the House of Representatives from some 18 States, let me read those States, Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, the Representatives from those States will have to go back over this weekend and next week and tell their constituents that they voted for this unfunded mandate, this unprecedented mandate on the use of their State revolving funds.

Now, if we are just talking about imposing this on Federal money, that is one thing. But the unprecedented part about this is they are imposing this, first of all, on repayments. It has never been done before. On interest into the State revolving loan fund, they are going to impose this, and also on the State match.

So what happens here is we put money in with good intention, you put more money in, and you get less in return, and we impose this mandate. We have tried not to impose mandates on our local governments.

So that is our objection to this, and that is the administration's objection to this.

We have no objection to providing assistance and a partnership with our local governments and State revolving wastewater treatment activities. That is a good thing. But what we are doing here is a bad thing. It is setting a precedent and imposing an unfunded mandate on our local governments, which we shouldn't be doing even with their money, their repayments, their interest and their match. It is setting a horrible precedent.

So I would like to be for this bill. I would like to vote for this legislation.

But I can't support it if we don't adopt the Baker-King amendment that takes this provision out.

To those of you who come from those States, and I am from one of them, Florida, I can't go back and say I have done this to you when I am trying to do something for you.

With those comments, I do want to clarify the unprecedented mandate that this is imposing. It is a big earmark for big union bosses. Our folks at the State and local levels are going to have to pay the price. I don't want them to have to pay that price.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Republican leader on the committee, Mr. MICA. Mr. DEFazio was referring to a mandate upon cities to improve their sewage treatment facilities, not to a mandate in this act.

Secondly, in our committee report, the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, says H.R. 720 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on State, local, or Tribal governments. So I can only assume the gentleman is making a statement of hyperbole, rather than a fact.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. I appreciate his leadership and that of the chairwoman, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. I salute the committee, which has done more on water resources in the last 12 weeks than we have seen the previous Republican leadership do on water resources in the last 12 years.

One of the reasons that we have had a roadblock dealing with these critical water resources has been the Republicans' pathological aversion to Davis-Bacon protections. Sometimes when I hear some of my conservative friends on the other side of the aisle fulminating about Davis-Bacon, I want them to go back and look at the history.

Davis-Bacon is named for the Republican sponsors of the legislation in the Hoover administration. It is not some sort of Democratic plot. In my State, in Oregon, we have adopted a "little Davis-Bacon Act" that was signed into law under a Republican Governor, former Senator Mark Hatfield. When the ideologues put it to the test, tried to repeal the protections, it was overwhelmingly supported by Oregonians almost two to one, and I would note that it passed in every Oregon county, big city or rural areas.

What we have seen is that Davis-Bacon protections level the playing field for bidding, so we are not going to have shoddy public works with inadequately trained and equipped workers. We have watched over time where the

amount of a public contract for construction for labor has actually declined as a percentage. So if they were ever concerned, they should have been concerned long ago when the Republicans introduced it in the Hoover administration.

I would hope, Madam Chairman, that this President does not continue holding water resources hostage by threatening a veto. For heaven's sake, vote Davis-Bacon up or down, but don't penalize American communities by short-changing water resources.

□ 1130

Mr. BAKER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important to understand the operative nature of the State Revolving Fund and the results of the legislation before us on that operation of the fund.

If a community in Florida, the ranking member's State, which has no prevailing Davis-Bacon requirement, borrows money from the revolving fund, there is a match associated with that which is State dollars. There is also interest that accrues on that loan. When the State repays the loan, the State repays the interest, that comes back into the revolving loan account.

Each year, as the Federal funds are made available, assume \$500 million would be made available of Federal resources for the revolving fund account, only that \$500 million under current rule would be subject to Davis-Bacon application. All of the repayment made by the State of Florida, including the interest, would be exempt from the applicability of a Davis-Bacon requirement.

"For the first time," and I read from the statement of administration policy, the White House statement on the matter, "For the first time ever, projects financed by funds contributed solely by States and moneys repaid to the State Revolving Fund will be subject to Davis-Bacon requirements."

So let there be no mistake about this, this is not merely voting to sustain Davis-Bacon as we currently know it. This is to expand the requirement for State-generated funds into States that have no Davis-Bacon requirement at the State level, and it will diminish those States' abilities to meet their identified water infrastructure needs. That is why this debate is occurring. It is not just about whether big business or big labor or the beneficiaries of some legislative initiative. This is about the real world in back home America, and are we going to provide the resources to help small communities get their water systems in decent and safe operating condition? We all agree that is a worthwhile goal.

The question is: How do we want to achieve it?

Do we want to constrain a free market system with arbitrary Washington rules that artificially drive up prices and give taxpayers less? Most of us think that is not advisable.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chairman, I thank you for the strong leadership that you have provided on this legislation.

I would like to talk to you briefly about the needs of colonias. As you know, many colonias exist around the borders in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California, only lacking the basic infrastructure that most Americans take for granted. Often these communities do not have paved roads, hospitals or even utilities. And when you look at the negative impact on the health of its residents, one of the greatest challenges we have is many colonias don't have access to water and sewer services.

As you know, many colonias do not have sewer systems, forcing residents to rely on often inadequate waste water disposal methods such as small and outdated septic tanks. And even if colonias had adequate sewer systems, the border area lacks sufficient facilities to treat the waste water that we have.

What I ask, Madam Chairman, I want to work with you and with Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON and other members of the committee to make sure that we pay special consideration to the needs of the colonias as you go into conference for H.R. 720 and as your committee reviews future legislation.

I thank you for your strong leadership on the colonias issue, Madam Chairman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds to assure the gentleman that this bill will go a long way towards helping States target additional support to the colonias, as well as other disadvantaged communities throughout the country.

We will soon bring up, within the next 2 weeks I hope, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 under the leadership of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON). In the past, we have had language to authorize the corps to help provide water and waste water infrastructure for the colonias.

We will work with the gentleman to provide such language in the future.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairwoman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana, my colleague, for yielding.

Let me just say, we all recognize that there is a funding gap here, and there are many, many needs throughout our Nation with regard to repairing our water infrastructure. But on the other hand, I think it is wrong to play politics with this.

When I heard we were going to bring forward a bill to deal with our State Revolving Loan Funds, I was very happy about it. I said, yes, this is something that is very much needed in

Louisiana and certainly needed for small rural, disadvantaged communities throughout our Nation.

Yet, what we have got now is a situation with the Davis-Bacon provisions inserted into this bill which is going to create significant problems.

I know we are all frozen politically on this issue, Davis-Bacon or no Davis-Bacon, depending upon which philosophical stripe you wear. But let me just say, we could have done something better coming out of committee with this bill if we would have created exemptions for poor, disadvantaged, small communities throughout the rural United States.

My fear is, with the bill as it stands, it is going to put our communities at a point where they can't access these funds.

Now our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about protecting the American worker and making sure that we are taking care of this big funding gap we have with regard to our aging water infrastructure. But on the one hand, if we create the State Revolving Loan Fund, and on the other hand, we make it unaffordable for our small and disadvantaged communities to access these funds, what good have we done?

I think we need to put aside politics and let's talk about practical policy here. Earlier this week I met with the president of our Police Jury Association, which is the equivalent of county commissioners. He told me that he was excited that we were looking at these funds for water. But when I mentioned the fact that we have Davis-Bacon provisions in the bill, he was very despondent. And he said to me, basically, that this is going to stifle our ability to repair our water infrastructure.

He estimated that it is going to add a 20-25 percent additional cost for sewer treatment facilities in his parish, Evangeline Parish, in rural Louisiana.

The bottom line is, we shouldn't be talking about inside-the-Beltway rhetoric. We need to listen to what real leaders in the real world are telling us. I would say, if Members on the other side, if you talk to those rural community leaders and find out what they need and how we can bridge this gap, you will find out that it is not by putting in Davis-Bacon provisions that will weight this bill down.

I believe Congress has a responsibility to address this growing need, but at the same time, we need to do it in a responsible way that is going to work and not something that is going to be just more political tit for tat, back and forth.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill because of the underlying provisions, the Davis-Bacon provisions, which are going to hurt small, disadvantaged communities. And ultimately, it is going to hurt the American worker.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Chairwoman, two points. The revolving fund has meant so much to the district I represent. The 12-town drain system before was an open sewer, and with the revolving fund help, we were able to address and attack the problem.

My second point is this: It is interesting that those who come here complaining about the Davis-Bacon provision have been in a party that has sat on its hands on this issue year after year and have come from a party whose President has suggested cutting the revolving fund by \$396 million.

You should have acted long ago to make the revolving fund more meaningful, and so don't use the prevailing wage issue as a reason to oppose this when you have failed to step up to the plate. We are stepping up to the plate here. More money and under circumstances that provide people a chance to have a decent way of life. I urge support of this bill.

I rise in strong support of the Water Quality Financing Act. The bill before the House calls for a significant and needed increase in the annual Federal contribution to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program. This may not be a well known program, but it has been absolutely critical to water quality improvements in my district, and in many other communities around the country.

The Clean Water Revolving Fund is the only major Federal program that helps localities build, repair, and improve their sewer infrastructure. Over the years, the Revolving Fund has provided more than a billion dollars to my home State of Michigan for low-interest loans for water infrastructure projects.

A billion dollars sounds like a lot of money, but it is literally just a drop in the bucket compared to the need. In southeast Michigan alone, maintaining and improving our aging sewer systems will cost between \$14 and \$26 billion over the next 30 years.

Let me tell you what the Clean Water Revolving Fund has meant to my district. In the early 1990s, the Clinton River that runs through my district in Oakland and Macomb Counties was little more than an open sewer. In particular, there was one, large combined sewer system called 12 Towns that spilled hundreds of millions of gallons of partially treated sewage into the Clinton River each year. This contributed to a nearly dead river and closed beaches downstream in Lake St. Clair. It was a major concern to both Oakland and Macomb counties.

In the late 1990s, the communities undertook an expensive renovation project at 12 Towns that has greatly reduced the sewer overflows. The communities bore the full expense for this project, which cost well over \$100 million, but the low interest rates provided by the Revolving Fund saved the communities tens of millions of dollars in interest costs. The result is that the Clinton River is making a comeback. Water quality is improving.

Twelve Towns is not an isolated example. The Revolving Fund has also helped many other communities in my district with critical water quality improvements. We could not have accomplished the progress that has been made to clean up the Clinton River and Lake St. Clair without the Revolving Fund's help.

The Federal Government has to do more—not less—to help communities shoulder the burden of addressing critical water infrastructure needs. We should have increased the funding for the Revolving Fund long before this; instead, in recent years the Bush Administration and Congress has cut the program again and again. Just last month, the President's budget proposed a \$396 million cut to the Revolving Fund. This takes the effort to clean up the Great Lakes in exactly the wrong direction.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for this important legislation. We should vote for the bill today and—just as importantly—provide the funding for the Clean Water Revolving Fund when we take up the EPA appropriations bill later this year.

Mr. BAKER. I have a speaker on his way, and so I would like to I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007. I urge swift passage of this matter.

Chairman OBERSTAR, thank you, thank you, thank you for addressing the issues of western America. Over the past 2 years, I have visited with folks from across the Third Congressional District of Colorado. Water is one of the issues that greatly affects every constituent in the arid southwest. My constituents are concerned about their water quality and supply, the aging infrastructure, and are concerned that their health is at risk.

Fast-growing rural areas are experiencing trouble with infrastructure demands, especially waste water treatment facilities. With revolving loan money on the decline, small rural communities have been struggling to address major infrastructure needs. This issue crosses lines of environment, health and human safety, growth and economic development.

Many of us view H.R. 720 as a long overdue measure to ensure that the Federal Government invests in waste water infrastructure. This legislation will not only ensure that we have undated waste water infrastructures; it will also reduce the burden of construction and maintenance costs on local towns and communities.

Now is the time for us to start investing in the infrastructure that will safeguard our water quality for future generations.

Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you. And thank you for understanding the struggles that rural America has. I don't understand our opposition on the other side and their opposition to prevailing wage and to a livable wage.

I would urge my colleagues to support investment in clean water infrastructure and passage of this bill.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member.

And the gentleman from Minnesota, I compliment you on your efforts here. It is important that we meet America's water needs all across the country.

I do have some reservations, however. My family owns a small construction company, and that is about the worst business you can be in in a State like Michigan where the economy is struggling. And they hire some union employees, not because the law tells them they have to do that but because they happen to find that their union subcontractors are the best ones to complete their job.

But what you have done in this bill is not for a prevailing wage and empowering people to make more money, you have stopped a whole segment of our society from even competing to get these jobs. There are hundreds and hundreds of regs and comments on how you compute Davis-Bacon. If you were going to go back and say, we will rework this thing so the average American understands what it is, we might be with you.

But the problem is, they can't afford consultants and lawyers. They can't hire people full time just to figure out the regulations so that they might be able to compete to fill out the application to compete for the bid. They are small, and there are a lot of small businesses.

What you are saying to the 80 percent of the entrepreneurs across America who are small business owners who are generating 80 percent of the growth in our economy, 80 percent: You don't qualify. We're sorry. Go get yourself a lawyer and a fancy accountant and spend a lot of money you don't have, and maybe you will have an opportunity to get a job if you can figure out the hundreds of pages of regulations and comments to comply with Davis-Bacon.

So it is not that you are going to get more on these projects, and I think your intentions are absolutely right, and I want to be with you because it is the right thing to do. But the problem is, it is not just going to cost more, you are going to get less. So the more money you put in means it is going to cost more, but we will get less pipe in the ground than if we had allowed a free market and the small entrepreneurs, who are creating jobs in America, to even have the chance to compete. Rules and regulations, taxation and litigation never met with prosperity. It has slowed us down, and it has slowed the small guy, the little guy, the people that you claim you want to support, from even competing.

I would hope that we could get over our differences on this particular issue and set it aside. We know that we want money to go to water infrastructure in rural America. Let's let them do that. Let's take this out. Let's let the little guy compete. Let's let that small entrepreneur who is working 7 days a week and doesn't know if they are

going to have enough money to pay the light bill, let alone take a salary this particular month in places like Michigan, let them compete. Let's take this divisive piece out of it. It won't change what you are wanting to do. That is the thing.

If you take this out, small America wins. Let's do that and stand together and be for water infrastructure around the United States.

□ 1145

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and my classmate of 1974.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank him and all of the members of this committee for their work on the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

This is a very important piece of legislation, as so many of my colleagues have already testified to. We desperately need, in communities all across the country, the upgrade and the repairing of our Nation's wastewater infrastructure. There is not a congressional district in the country where we are not behind the curve on this effort.

I also rise because this legislation does continue the prevailing wage laws of this Nation, the Davis-Bacon law, which guarantees hardworking Americans, those who are working in Federal construction projects, will be paid a livable wage.

Today, we see report after report, economic study after economic study that talks about the precarious state of the American middle class, about how families are struggling to maintain their status in the middle class. It is one of the imperatives of this new Congress, of the Democratic majority, to grow and to strengthen the middle class; and, clearly, the wages that people pay will play a great part in that.

We should not have Federal dollars, Federal contracts and Federal projects, whether they are in conjunction with locales or not, undermining those livable wages. These wages are incredibly important to the American middle-class family.

We see now that the hardworking Americans and middle class, with the greatest productivity gains in recent history, are sharing the very smallest part of that increase in productivity than at any time in recent history.

It is imperative that we have today Davis-Bacon protections in this law. It is imperative that we have the Davis-Bacon protections for middle-class families in the country.

We know middle-class families now are constantly confronting the risk of what is happening to their pensions: Will they be funded? Will they be ter-

minated? Will they be frozen? What is their ability to put away money in a 401(k) plan? What is their ability to purchase health care? How much more of the cost of that health care is going to be shifted from the employer to the employee? How much more of that are they going to be able to afford?

Maintaining good wages for good quality work is important to these families. It is important to these projects, and it is important to this Nation.

I commend the chairman for reporting this bill to the floor with these provisions in it, to ensure that we continue to grow and strengthen the middle class in this country.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. For over 75 years Davis-Bacon has guaranteed that hard-working Americans working on federal construction projects will be paid a livable wage. I am pleased that the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007 includes Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provisions and requires that prevailing wage rules be applied to all projects financed in whole or in part through State Revolving Fund programs (SRFs). I vehemently oppose any and all efforts that are intended to strip the prevailing wage provision and undermine the long-standing tradition of Davis-Bacon.

The Water Quality Financing Act of 2007 will be one of approximately 70 Federal laws that include a Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision. Throughout these laws Davis-Bacon has infused fairness into Federal contract work; and it has protected contractors and workers from unjust treatment and unfair competition.

As more and more families struggle to pay the bills, it is critical now more than ever that we ensure hard-working Americans earn a livable wage.

On a bipartisan basis Congress has historically stood together in support of Davis-Bacon, recognizing the obligation that we have to ensure that Americans are paid a livable wage and to ensure the government does not operate to undermine those wages. As we consider H.R. 720 today we again have a moral obligation to stand up and set the example for how workers should be treated and the standard by which they should be compensated.

GOVERNMENT PROJECTS BENEFIT FROM A PREVAILING WAGE PROVISION

The Water Quality Financing Act of 2007 addresses the critical need that we have to build, upgrade and repair this nation's waste water infrastructure. Davis-Bacon ensures that we hire the best people to do this important work.

Requiring that employers pay the local prevailing wage encourages them to hire qualified and highly skilled workers. This in turn results in a higher quality of work and higher productivity; it leads to less waste; it reduces the need for supervision; and fewer mistakes are made which require corrective action.

The fact is that Davis-Bacon helps ensure that projects are completed on time and in the long-term require less rehabilitation and repair. Thanks to decent work standards, these projects don't suffer staggering delays and taxpayers do not have to shoulder additional and unintended costs produced by the delays or a substandard work product.

DAVIS-BACON HELPS LOCAL BUSINESSES

Davis-Bacon furthers the viability of local businesses who want to compete for government contracts. The Act protects local employers from cutthroat competition that results from fly-by-night firms who try to undercut local wages and working conditions and who unfairly compete with local contractors.

PREVAILING WAGES

It's important to remember what a prevailing wage is. A prevailing wage is defined as the weighted average of all the wage rates paid to laborers or mechanics in the same classification in the same locality. It is literally the wage that prevails in the local market. The government, when making contracts, should respect those prevailing rates. The government should not be in the business of using taxpayer funds to drive down wages in a locality.

DEFEATING PRESIDENT BUSH'S REPEAL OF DAVIS-BACON

We've seen efforts to undermine the nation's wage laws time and time again and defeated them time and time again. Two years ago Congress successfully defeated President Bush's attempts to repeal Davis-Bacon during the rebuilding of the Gulf Coast after Hurricane Katrina. At a time when the victims of the hurricane had lost everything—their homes, their belongings, even family members—some political forces thought it would be a good idea to also cut their wages. In a bipartisan effort, Congress stood together and convinced the President to abandon his efforts; in doing so we ensured that those rebuilding the Gulf would be justly compensated for their hard work. I'm proud of the fact that support for Davis-Bacon has always been on a bipartisan basis—and I expect such bipartisan support for this fundamental worker protection will prevail again today.

Madam Chairman, it is time for us to once again stand up for the rights and the dignity of workers across this country. Let's continue the tradition that began over 75 years ago—support the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provisions contained within the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I only have one remaining speaker. May I inquire if the gentleman has multiple speakers remaining?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBERSTAR. And the gentleman has only one speaker remaining?

Mr. BAKER. Correct, sir.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE).

Mr. HARE. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

When I met with local economic development administration officials in Moline, Illinois, over the February recess, reauthorizing and ensuring adequate funding for the State revolving loan fund was stated as the number one need that these administrators had in assisting the rural communities in my district. We all know that the ability to process and treat wastewater, as

well as provide clean water to a community, is the biggest challenge to economic development. In an area hard hit by offshoring and outsourcing of jobs, this assistance is critical to the 17th Congressional District of Illinois.

The Clean Water Revolving Fund is a top priority of the Democrats, and it authorizes \$14 billion for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities and other water pollution abatement projects.

In addition, this bill renews the requirement that contractors and subcontractors on wastewater treatment projects constructed with assistance from the State revolving funds be paid at least the prevailing local wage rate, as determined under the Davis-Bacon Act. By guaranteeing payment of the prevailing local wage rate, Davis-Bacon provides a better standard of living.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Water Quality Financing Act to address your constituents' clean water needs and to uphold these important labor standards.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Water Quality Financing Act, an act that is essential for our country.

For the past 4 years, the water quality needs of our Nation's communities and my constituents have been neglected. Rural communities along the Texas-Mexican border in my district do not have the resources or the financial capacity to renovate existing water treatment plans and to construct sewage management systems.

These are basic issues in our country where people are still having difficulty getting access to potable water.

I have already heard from the small cities of Sabinal, Clint, Fort Stockton, Presidio, and Fort Hancock, Texas, all of which are in desperate need of assistance with their wastewater management. These and many other communities stand to benefit significantly from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.

This legislation will authorize a significant increase in funding for the fund, allowing these communities, like those in my district and throughout this country, to secure loans and begin work on the water improvement programs that are needed for our citizens.

I ask you to support this specific legislation that allows these individuals to be able to get access to good, potable water.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, let me thank the chairman for his leadership and the chairwoman of the subcommittee, Eddie Bernice Johnson, for her leadership.

Texas, under the President's budget, lost \$18 million, and with the restoration of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund of \$14 billion, we will see now the possibility of the restoration of \$49,413,000, a total that we had in the 2007 funding level and going up.

I know what it is like to deal with communities that do not have clean water. Bordersville in Houston, Texas, now has the opportunity to engage and use these dollars to build this community and develop clean water. The EPA recognizes that we have had difficulty across America and water crises and bad water.

This bill makes a good statement. It also makes the positive statement on prevailing wages. There simply is no excuse to not give people a living wage, and that is what prevailing wages are all about.

I want to thank my colleagues for recognizing that water is the source of life and the importance of making sure that the 34 percent cut by this Republican Congress in years past now needs to be amended and fixed. Today we fix it.

I rise in support of H.R. 720, and I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the "Water Quality Financing Act of 2007," which authorizes \$14 billion over four years for the clean water State Revolving Fund (SRF) for fiscal years 2008 through 2011. This bill will go a long way toward restoring the \$18 million cut in Texas share of the SRF.

Under the SRF program, the Environmental Protection Agency provides grants to States, and the States provide matching funds to establish a low-cost loan program to enable communities to upgrade wastewater treatment systems.

Madam Chairman, the Administration has not sought reauthorization for the revolving fund, preferring to turn the revolving fund into a self-sustaining loan program that is replenished by interest payments made on loans.

H.R. 720 reauthorizes the program at an annual funding level of \$4 billion per year, well above the level of \$1 billion contained in the fiscal year 2007 appropriations bill for EPA currently working its way through Congress.

The bill would extend repayment periods for revolving fund loans up to 30 years, require a State to use part of its funding to provide subsidies for disadvantaged communities, and authorize \$75 million annually in technical assistance to rural and small wastewater treatment projects.

H.R. 720 also directs the Government Accountability Office to study potential revenue sources to set up a Clean Water Trust Fund and encourage communities to consider "green infrastructure" such as the use of rain gardens to collect storm water runoff. The bill also uses water quality benefits and a watershed approach as the criteria to prioritize which projects receive funding.

Madam Chairman, it is no exaggeration to state that the Clean Water Act is the Nation's most successful environmental law. But the continued high quality of the Nation's water supplies is imperiled because over the past six years the Congress has not invested enough

funding to replace or repair the aging and deteriorating wastewater infrastructure.

The State revolving fund's steady source of Federal funding ran out when reauthorization expired in 1994. Since then, Congress has been unable to get any bills affecting the fund through the House or the Senate because of disputes over Davis-Bacon Act requirements that local prevailing wages be paid on projects receiving Federal funds. Instead, Congress has been appropriated funds for the SRF on an annual basis, but at declining levels. The lack of a steady, dependable source of funding has had a detrimental effect on the ability of water management agencies to repair, build, and upgrade the Nation's water quality infrastructure. It puts at risk the Nation's clean water.

Madam Chairman, according to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO), there is a "funding gap" of \$300 billion to \$500 billion over 20 years between what is needed and what is actually spent on our water quality infrastructure. Without a Federal recommitment to clean water, the costs of maintaining existing and aging infrastructure further stressed by ever increasing population and industrial demands, as well as new and costly Clean Water Act requirements must be borne at the local level.

Madam Chairman, the needs of municipalities, counties, and towns have simply outgrown the funding levels of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF). The SRF program has been under siege since 2004, plummeting from \$1.35 billion in 2004 to less than \$700 million proposed for 2007. A dedicated source of Federal funding must be identified to assure adequate and continued financial assistance to municipalities to meet the goals of the Federal water quality program. H.R. 720 takes a major step in this direction and provides a significant down payment on the investment that must be made to ensure the quality of the Nation's water supply.

Madam Chairman, I support the objectives of establishing a Clean Water Trust fund. Such a dedicated trust fund for clean water will ensure that infrastructure modernization and maintenance remains a priority and will secure the long-term viability of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF), while also adding a significant grant component to help communities fully achieve the goals of the Clean Water Act.

I also support expanded eligibility under the SRF for water conservation measures. This would enable consumers to make more efficient use of treated water, including incentives for the modification, retirement, replacement of customer-owned water-using equipment, appliances, plumbing fixtures, and landscape materials. Saving water through improved efficiency can lessen the need to withdraw ground or surface water supplies for municipal or industrial demands. Strategic use of water conservation not only helps save the Nation's water resources but also can help extend the value and life of both water supply and wastewater treatment infrastructure, extending the beneficial investment of public funds.

Finally, Madam Chairman, I strongly support the Davis-Bacon provisions in H.R. 720 requiring that workers on projects funded through the SRF not be paid less than the prevailing wage. By guaranteeing payment of the prevailing local wage rate, Davis-Bacon provides

MARCH 6, 2007.

a better standard of living and economic security for these workers.

Madam Chairman, Davis-Bacon "prevailing wage" standards are set by scientific surveys of actual wages paid in local communities. Accordingly, Davis-Bacon wages in lower-cost areas such as rural communities and small towns are closely tied to existing local wages and therefore ensure a reasonable wage comparable to those earned by other workers in that community. Obviously, the prevailing wage rates in higher-cost areas such as major urban centers are higher because the average wage and cost-of-living are higher. Moreover, in 1981, the implementing regulations for Davis-Bacon were specifically amended to prohibit the Department of Labor from using wage data collected in urban areas to make a prevailing wage determination in a nearby rural county.

Madam Chairman, I will strongly oppose any amendments by the minority to eliminate, weaken, or alter the Davis-Bacon provisions within this legislation. These are the latest in a long history of Republican attacks on the Davis-Bacon Act and the protections it provides to workers. Not only have three Republican presidents temporarily suspended the Act, but many of Republican colleagues have sought to repeal it altogether.

For all of these reasons, I strongly support H.R. 720 and urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for its adoption by the House. I also call upon my colleagues to oppose any amendments to weaken this critical legislation that will address the real needs of the American people.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I wish to express sincere and deep appreciation to the gentlewoman who is the Chair of the Water Resources Subcommittee and, of course, to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBERSTAR. In thinking back over my tenure on the committee, it really is hard to remember a time when there has been significant partisan difference. It truly is one of the committees of the House that works in a unified way and produces a consistent, unified voice.

We share the vision that America's infrastructure is the key to our Nation's economic future and that where infrastructure is damaged or inadequate, economies lag behind, employment is high, and circumstances are not good. So we really are joined here together in an effort to do what we believe is right and best for communities we represent.

In this one instance, we find ourselves on the opposite side of a policy which has, over time, divided this Congress, the requirement by government to tell those engaged in a business endeavor what you should pay your employees in meeting essential public need.

It is clear to me that in my home State, the economic dislocations because of the tragic storms is immense and widespread and felt deeply and unfortunately will be likely felt for many years to come. We all know that there aren't sufficient resources to solve every problem in every community and

certainly not even in our own State. Despite the generosity of the American people and this Congress, there will be billions of dollars of unmet need.

The question, as we go to Dr. Boustany's district in southwest Louisiana to a small, small rural parish in Cameron, where there isn't even a municipality, where after the storm's terrible surge went across the land, you could stand on the northern edge of the parish and look all the way to the gulf coast and not see a structure standing. We don't have enough money to build it all back. We can't even tell people even when we are likely to build it back, but we are going to send some money, now in the form of a State revolving fund intended for the restructuring and rebuilding of critical water infrastructure.

What are we going to do with that \$10? Are we going to artificially increase the cost of that project just to make it more difficult for rural Cameron parish to recover? I don't think we really want or intend to do that, but that is the consequence of this provision in this bill. It makes recovery more difficult. It will take recovery longer. It will cost more to build less.

We all pride ourselves in America on our strong free enterprise beliefs. Let's turn free enterprise loose. Let's let Louisiana rebuild. Let's do it in the most efficient and expeditious way possible. Let's strike Davis-Bacon provisions from this bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time, which should be about a minute.

Again, I express my great appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the ranking member on the full committee, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), who I have the greatest respect for, and I recall his distinguished and authoritative presentation during the committee tour post-Katrina at Baton Rouge where the gentleman had a mastery of the facts of the issues at hand, and we stood in solidarity and we do stand in solidarity on this legislation.

We have one difference of opinion. That is why we have a legislative body and a process through which to work these issues out, and as the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, said very thoughtfully many years ago, something like 60 years ago, We can agree to disagree without being disagreeable, and that is the manner in which I hope we will continue to conduct issues before our committee.

I just think back to the time when I worked, when I was in college working in construction jobs, and I was working as a truck driver and cement puddler for 50 cents below what was a union wage, below what was a standard wage, because this wasn't a unionized job, and I don't want to see that happen to anybody.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I submit the following exchange of letters between Mr. RANGEL, Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and me.

Hon. JAMES OBERSTAR,
*Chairman, Transportation and Infrastructure
Committee, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR JIM: I am writing regarding H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007, which is scheduled for floor action later this week.

As you know, H.R. 720 raises revenue by increasing vessel tonnage duties, an authority which falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. In addition, H.R. 720 violates clause 5(a) of Rule XXI, which restricts bills and amendments from carrying taxes and tariffs not reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

In order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill, and will not oppose H.R. 720 being given a waiver of Rule XXI. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation in the future.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confining this understanding with respect to H.R. 720, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the record.

Sincerely,

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman.

MARCH 8, 2007.

Hon. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington,
DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN RANGEL: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the consideration of H.R. 720, "the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007". Your support for this legislation and your assistance in ensuring its timely consideration are greatly appreciated.

I agree that section 601 of H.R. 720, as reported, is of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Ways and Means. I acknowledge that, by foregoing a sequential referral, your Committee is not relinquishing its jurisdiction and I will fully support your request to be represented in a House-Senate conference on those provisions over which the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction in H.R. 720.

I value your cooperation and look forward to working with you as we move ahead with this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.,
Chairman.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chairman, I sadly rise today to oppose this important legislation. Unfortunately, in a kickback to Unions, the Majority has decided to include in this legislation provisions that will drive up the cost of state water projects and are particularly harmful to small rural communities.

As a New Mexican, I know the critical role water plays in economic expansion and the daily need of our citizens. We in New Mexico struggle to find good clean water for our communities. The reauthorization of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund Program is an important step to meeting the needs of my communities.

Communities in my district like Columbus, New Mexico, a small community of 1700 people which has no clean running water in its community, is desperate for assistance from a

program like the one we will authorize today. Sadly, the majority has decided that this poor community should have foisted upon it Federal Davis-Bacon requirements which were never intended to be applied to non-Federal funds. Instead of helping communities get clean water projects the majority has decided to inflate the cost of these projects with unnecessary provisions that will result in fewer clean water projects, fewer jobs and less clean water.

I don't understand how the inclusion of these provisions that inflate costs will benefit the small rural communities who can barely afford clean water projects in the first place. Sadly, those provisions prevent me from supporting this otherwise good legislation.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Chairman, I rise today to support the Baker amendment and to oppose the underlying bill, H.R. 720.

I had hoped to support this legislation, which would allow States and municipalities to build water treatment plants and other necessary infrastructure.

Unfortunately, our friends in the Democratic majority have taken away the rights of States and municipalities by forcing them to comply with Federal Davis-Bacon requirements, which waste taxpayer dollars by inflating construction costs.

My state of Florida does not have a state prevailing wage law. This legislation would force small, rural communities in my district and throughout Florida to pay vastly inflated Federal prevailing wages to build these critical infrastructure projects. Studies have shown that Davis-Bacon inflates the cost of construction by up to 38 percent in rural areas.

I cannot support imposing the antiquated Davis-Bacon requirements on my local communities—wasting their hard-earned tax dollars on inflated construction costs. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this legislation, and yes to the Baker Amendment.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the “Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.” As we all know, H.R. 720 will reauthorize the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and provide \$14 billion in funding for the program over the next four years. The bill provides technical assistance to rural and small municipalities for the purpose of assisting them in the planning, developing, and acquisition of financing for wastewater infrastructure assistance. The bill also provides technical assistance and training for rural and small publicly owned treatment works and decentralized wastewater treatment systems to enable such treatment works and systems to protect water quality and achieve and maintain compliance with the bill's requirements. Equally important, the bill will disseminate information to rural and small municipalities and municipalities that meet the affordability criteria established under section 603(i)(2) by the State in which the municipality is located with respect to planning, design, construction, and operation of publicly owned treatment works and decentralized wastewater treatment systems.

With 20 percent of the country's population living in rural communities, it's critical that we address their infrastructure needs including access to clean water, working sewers, electricity, and other necessities. For more than a decade, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund has been integral to State's and localities in their effort to deal with critical clean water infrastructure needs.

As a community, our progress must be judged not by the status of our most fortunate members of society, but by that of our most challenged members. That is why I am committed to fighting for the resources needed to ensure a better standard of living for all Colonia residents, why I voted in favor of H.R. 720, and why I co-founded and currently am Chairman of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus. I founded the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus to advocate for legislation and policy changes that: expand the availability of safe and affordable housing—both for purchase and for rental—in Rural America; eliminate substandard housing in Rural America; and especially to address the infrastructure needs of Rural America, including providing access to clean water, working sewers, electricity, and other necessities. This bill is an important step toward meeting the goals of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

There are more than 350,000 people who struggle in the unacceptable living conditions of the Colonias every day. Many Colonias do not have sewer systems. Instead, residents must rely on alternative, often inadequate wastewater disposal methods. Surveys of Colonias in El Paso and the Rio Grande Valley show that 50.7 percent of the households use septic tanks, 36.4 percent use cesspools, 7.4 percent use outhouses, and 5.5 percent use other means to dispose of wastewater. Septic tank systems, which in some circumstances may provide adequate wastewater disposal, often pose problems because they are too small or improperly installed and can overflow.

Even if the colonias had adequate sewer systems, the border area lacks sufficient facilities to treat wastewater. According to a summary report by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), wastewater treatment capacity along the U.S.-Mexico border has been inadequate for the past decade. In many places, there are no treatment facilities at all. Consequently, border communities often discharge untreated or inadequately treated wastewater into rivers, canals and arroyos (a creek or stream), which then flow into the Gulf of Mexico. In the Nuevo Laredo/Laredo area alone, 27 million gallons of untreated waste-water are discharged directly into the Rio Grande each day, contributing to ecological and aesthetic degradation, economic loss and threats to public health. Securing potable water also presents a challenge to Colonia residents. Many must buy water by the bucket or drum to meet their daily needs or use wells that may be contaminated.

According to The Colonias Factbook, a Texas Department of Human Services survey of living conditions in rural areas of South and West Texas border counties, 23.7 percent of the households did not have treated water in the house. Because of this, the survey found, untreated water was used by 12.8 percent of households to wash dishes, 13.1 percent to wash clothes, 12.3 percent to bathe and 4.9 percent to cook.

A 1995 Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) study estimates that 428 colonias with about 81,000 people are in need of potable water facilities, and 1,195 colonias with about 232,000 people need wastewater treatment facilities. The TWDB estimates it would cost more than \$424 million to build the water and wastewater facilities needed in the 23 counties surveyed.

In my district, these issues are increased by the low-incomes and housing quality problems suffered by my constituents. According to the 2000 Census, the median income for persons living in the 15th district was \$26,840. There are more than 7,500 households that lack complete plumbing facilities. Crowding is a problem as more than 15 percent of all occupied housing units are crowded (i.e., more than one person per room).

The battle to improve every Colonia in South Texas will require enormous resources and support from program partners, community residents, and especially the Federal Government. This is a battle we must win, and I know we will win. The problems in the Colonias are not just the Colonias' problems, but they are the State's problems they are the Nation's problems—and they are our problems.

Passage of today's legislation will go a long way toward improving the quality of life of residents of the Colonias and towards attaining the goals of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

Rest assured that I will continue to fight for legislation, regulations and programs that understand the needs of Colonia and all rural residents. I will fight to fund programs that educate Colonia residents and empower them with the tools needed to live not for today, but for every day.

Where there is a will, there is a way. And as we say in my district and around the world—*Si Se Puede!*

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007. This bill is the third water bill brought to the floor this week. These three bills are filled with excessive spending, propose no way to pay for the increased spending, create duplicative bureaucracies, and impose requirements leading to inefficiencies that will lead taxpayers to getting less work for each Federal dollar spent. H.R. 720 is fiscally irresponsible.

The fact is, Madam Chairman, we already have a program in operation designed to help State and local communities with water and sewer projects—The State Revolving Fund (SRF). The SRF is a fiscally responsible program that provides Federal assistance through loans and other cost-sharing arrangements to help States assist municipalities with high priority projects. I support the SRF and believe it strikes an appropriate balance between Federal and State responsibility with respect to improving water systems in communities across the country. While today's bill authorizes SRF funding, the Congressional Budget Office has determined that in total the bill will actually suck about \$49 million over 5 years away from the SRF to be used in two new and less effective grant programs created in H.R. 720. Unlike SRF funds, these no-strings-attached grants do not have to be repaid and, in my estimation, will encourage States and municipalities to rely too heavily on Federal funding for improving their communities.

Unfortunately, creating more government bureaucracy and undermining an existing loan program is not even the worst of this bill. H.R. 720 also amounts to a kickback to special interest labor unions. This bill imposes on States costly Davis-Bacon labor rules. Democrats are telling the American taxpayers that inserting special provisions for their political base is more important than fiscal responsibility. Under Davis-Bacon, any project funded

through this bill will cost American taxpayers a 15 percent surcharge. This mandate effectively reduces the number of projects that can be completed under H.R. 720 by 15 percent. Adding a 15 percent surcharge will only serve to delay projects addressing water supply shortages and sewage treatment problems. The Davis-Bacon provision also discriminates against smaller—often minority owned—businesses that don't have the means to comply with its owner requirements.

Finally, Madam Chairman, H.R. 720 raises taxes—\$256 million over 5 years.

In short, today's bill is an excellent case study for the new Democratic Majority's priorities: More expensive bureaucracy, a kickback to labor at taxpayers' expense, creation of duplicative government programs, and a hidden tax increase on ordinary Americans.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 720.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of the Water Quality Financing Act, H.R. 720, and I commend Chairman OBERSTAR for working so hard to bring it to the floor today.

This bill reauthorizes the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, a necessary program providing low-interest loans to communities for construction of wastewater treatment facilities and other water projects.

H.R. 720 authorizes \$14 billion over the next 4 years for the fund, which will go a long way toward helping America's cities and towns fix their wastewater infrastructure.

This is a critical program. Since it was created in 1987, the fund has partnered with local and State governments to drastically improve America's water quality.

As a result of dramatic improvements in wastewater infrastructure due in part to this fund, discharges of waste into the environment have decreased by one-half since the early 1970's.

In my home State of New Jersey, the fund has been enormously helpful. New Jersey was granted almost \$2 billion during fiscal years 1987 through 2005, almost all of which was used for wastewater treatment projects. This much-needed funding has been instrumental in helping my State keep its water clean and its citizens safe and healthy.

The fact is: This bill is long overdue.

We know all too well that progress cannot be achieved on the cheap. If we want clean water for ourselves and future generations, we must invest in it.

The longer we wait, the more degraded our systems get.

I urge my colleagues to vote. "yes" on this bill today.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to express my support for H.R. 720 and my strong opposition to the amendment that seeks to remove Davis-Bacon wage protections from the bill. Addressing the Nation's urgent wastewater infrastructure needs by strengthening and recapitalizing the Clean Water State Revolving Fund is critically important. Retaining the requirement that workers be paid the local prevailing wage will help ensure that these projects yield the greatest benefit to the communities they are meant to help.

Davis-Bacon not only guarantees that workers receive a fair wage; it helps ensure the quality of the work because it removes the incentive for hiring less qualified workers for a

job. Paying prevailing wages also means that businesses and workers in the community where the work is taking place have a fair shot at getting the job and are less likely to be undercut by contractors who bid lower but then cut corners. A well-built project at a fair price should be our goal—not the cheapest possible job where workers' qualifications and quality of work may be compromised.

I want to congratulate Chairman OBERSTAR on moving this critical bill through the committee and to the floor in such a timely fashion. I am very proud to be a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and to be able to tell my constituents that help in upgrading our wastewater systems is on the way.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Chairman, I am here today because one of our most precious natural resources is under siege. As the world's largest freshwater system, the Great Lakes provide food, recreation, and drinking water for nearly 40 million people. Yet with each day, our water grows more contaminated with sewage discharged from municipalities along the lakes.

Nearly 24 billion gallons of sewage are dumped into the Great Lakes each year. While cities like Milwaukee have begun to reduce the amounts of sewage they discharge, not enough is being done to terminate this harmful practice. Detroit, for example, dumps 13.2 billion gallons of sewage per year into the lakes. This has a devastating effect on the region's tourism sector. Studies estimate an economic loss of roughly \$8,000 per day as a result of closing a Lake Michigan beach due to pollution. In 2005, sewage discharges contributed to the nearly 3,000 Great Lakes' beach closures, an increase of 5 percent over the previous year. In my own district, there were 150 beach closures in just 92 days of summer in 2004. This is unacceptable.

For years, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund has helped to fund billions of dollars worth of water quality projects, but Federal funding for this program is declining. The Environmental Protection Agency and the Government Accountability Office estimated a \$500 billion shortfall in clean water infrastructure investment over the next two decades. The important legislation in front of us would increase the authorization for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, which is imperative if we want to escape this massive shortfall. I had proposed an amendment establishing an added financing mechanism while also adding significant incentive for States and cities to eliminate their pollution into the Great Lakes.

The Kirk amendment would have set a date certain, 2027, to end sewage dumping directly into the Great Lakes by increasing fines for dumping to \$100,000 per violation, per day. The next 20 years would allow municipalities to upgrade their sewage system and ensure a level playing field for all communities along the Great Lakes. This would not affect any current dumping restrictions or regulation. The amendment further would have established a Great Lakes clean-up fund within the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, to which all sewage dumping penalties would be directed. Funds would be used to spur projects to improve wastewater discharges and protect the water quality of our lakes with a special focus on greener options such as habitat protection and wetland restoration.

This amendment would have also required both cities and the EPA to publicly report

dumping levels of sewage a year after enactment. Currently there is no uniform standard for public disclosure of wastewater violations. It is imperative that we understand the extent of the problem we are facing, and that education begins with public disclosure of all dumping into the Great Lakes.

With the growing populations living along the American and Canadian shores of the Great Lakes, it is appropriate to set a date that gives cities the time to make needed changes to their infrastructure to prohibit sewage dumping in the Great Lakes. We must preserve Great Lakes beaches, maintain the region's economic growth and protect the nation's largest supply of drinking water.

Madam Chairman, I support this bill in its current form. It would have been a better bill had the congressional leadership allowed the Kirk amendment to be considered. I do not understand why the House Democratic Leadership opposes setting a deadline to ban sewage dumping in Lake Michigan and other Great Lakes. By blocking my amendment, the congressional leadership missed a key opportunity to protect our environment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007 because it restores much-needed funding for our Nation's wastewater infrastructure, and establishes a mechanism to finally bring Arizona its fair share of Federal funds.

For nearly three decades, the Federal Government has short-changed Arizona on wastewater infrastructure. Instead of allocating funds based on needs it has inequitably and inexplicably continued to use 1970 Census data as a part of its allocation formula.

Since 1970, our State has more than tripled in population. As a result, we have become the victims of an alarming disparity.

Arizona currently ranks 10th in need, and 20th in population, but only 38th in receipt of Federal funding for Clean Water State Revolving Funds.

On a per capita basis, Arizona ranks 53rd. We are dead-last. Even the territories do better than we do. This is unfair, and needs to change.

Fortunately, H.R. 720 will begin that process. It lays the groundwork for a transition away from the current, inequitable, allocation formula, and toward a new formula based on need.

Of course, the House is not the last word on this. The Senate will have its say as well. Fortunately, our state has a great champion in our distinguished Senator JON KYL. He has been a leader on this issue, and many other water issues, and I know he will fight to ensure that Arizona gets what it deserves as this bill works its way through the Senate. And when, I hope, this bill goes to conference, I look forward to working with Senator KYL, for the good of our State.

Before I conclude, I want to express my gratitude to our chairman, JAMES OBERSTAR. His mastery of transportation issues is exceeded only by his fairness, his willingness to listen, and his incredible ability to bring people together. It has been an honor to work with him on this bill, and I look forward to working with him as it continues its way through Congress.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 720, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007. After 12 long years of little to no legislation supporting the environment, I am happy to stand up today to support a week of great environmental bills.

In celebration of Clean Environment Week in this House, the Democratic majority has brought forward three bills that will be good for the environment, good for the economy, and good for the people of New York and the rest of the Nation.

This bill, H.R. 720, will reauthorize the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund. The goal of this bill is to provide money to local governments in order for cities and towns across the country to improve and renovate their clean water infrastructure. The communities that will be using this money are extremely supportive of this bill.

The Clean Water Fund is essential to help States and municipalities make critical upgrades to their water infrastructure systems. In turn, these investments ensure clean water and foster economic development.

One of the most successful environmental programs in our Nation's history was the Clean Water Act of 1972. In the 35 years that it has been in existence, the Clean Water Act has helped to ensure that the water we drink as well as the bodies of water that we enjoy in nature will be clean and safe for use.

H.R. 720 will allow us to continue receiving the benefits of the Clean Water Act. It authorizes up to \$20 billion over the next 5 years to keep our water and our environment clean.

Another bill we supported this week is H.R. 569, legislation to boost sewer overflow controls. This bill will authorize \$1.8 billion over 5 years to prevent combined sewer overflow. Sewer overflow affects over 750 municipalities across the country.

During a heavy rainstorm, inadequate sewer facilities and infrastructure can easily overflow, causing major health concerns as well as an environmental mess. Madam Chairman, nobody here wants to see what happens when a sewer overflows into bodies of water around our neighborhoods. Yet Congress has done nothing to combat this problem over the past decade, despite a desperate need for action.

The total cost for fixing combined sewer systems across the country has been estimated to be about \$50 billion. We cannot expect small towns and local governments to be able to pay for this renovation by themselves. And this problem is not lessening. Every year, we see antiquated sewer systems backing up and outdated infrastructure crumbling. The problem is getting worse, and the longer we wait, the more we will have to pay to fix it.

Combined sewer backups are likely to occur in 37 States and the District of Columbia. My home State of New York is one of the 37 States affected. The 17th District of New York straddles the Hudson River, which can flood under heavy rain conditions. Madam Chairman, I for one do not want to wait until we have sewers backing up in our own backyard before we take action. We have waited long enough, and passing H.R. 569 was a good first step in fixing these aging sewer systems.

For all these reasons, I support H.R. 720, and I would encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in

the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 110–36, is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 720

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—This Act may be cited as the “Water Quality Financing Act of 2007”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Amendment of Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

TITLE I—TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE

Sec. 101. Technical assistance.

Sec. 102. State management assistance.

Sec. 103. Watershed pilot projects.

TITLE II—CONSTRUCTION OF TREATMENT WORKS

Sec. 201. Sewage collection systems.

Sec. 202. Treatment works defined.

Sec. 203. Policy on cost effectiveness.

TITLE III—STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING FUNDS

Sec. 301. General authority for capitalization grants.

Sec. 302. Capitalization grant agreements.

Sec. 303. Water pollution control revolving loan funds.

Sec. 304. Allotment of funds.

Sec. 305. Intended use plan.

Sec. 306. Annual reports.

Sec. 307. Technical assistance.

Sec. 308. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Definition of treatment works.

Sec. 402. Funding for Indian programs.

TITLE V—STUDIES

Sec. 501. Study of long-term, sustainable, clean water funding.

Sec. 502. Feasibility study of supplemental and alternative clean water funding mechanisms.

TITLE VI—TONNAGE DUTIES

Sec. 601. Tonnage duties.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

TITLE I—TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 101. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) *TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL AND SMALL TREATMENT WORKS.*—Section 104(b) (33 U.S.C. 1254(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) make grants to nonprofit organizations—
“(A) to provide technical assistance to rural and small municipalities for the purpose of assisting, in consultation with the State in which the assistance is provided, such municipalities in the planning, developing, and acquisition of financing for eligible projects described in section 603(c);

“(B) to provide technical assistance and training for rural and small publicly owned

treatment works and decentralized wastewater treatment systems to enable such treatment works and systems to protect water quality and achieve and maintain compliance with the requirements of this Act; and

“(C) to disseminate information to rural and small municipalities and municipalities that meet the affordability criteria established under section 603(i)(2) by the State in which the municipality is located with respect to planning, design, construction, and operation of publicly owned treatment works and decentralized wastewater treatment systems.”.

(b) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—Section 104(u) (33 U.S.C. 1254(u)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and (6)” and inserting “(6)”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “; and (7) not to exceed \$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012 for carrying out subsections (b)(3) and (b)(8), except that not less than 20 percent of the amounts appropriated pursuant to this paragraph in a fiscal year shall be used for carrying out subsection (b)(8)”;.

(c) *SMALL FLOWS CLEARINGHOUSE.*—Section 104(q)(4) (33 U.S.C. 1254(q)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(2) in the second sentence by striking “1986” and inserting “2009”.

(d) *COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES FOR AWARDED GRANTS.*—Section 104 (33 U.S.C. 1254(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(w) *COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES FOR AWARDED GRANTS.*—The Administrator shall establish procedures that, to the maximum extent practicable, promote competition and openness in the award of grants to nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations under this section.”.

SEC. 102. STATE MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE.

Section 106(a) (33 U.S.C. 1256(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2007, and \$300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012;”.

SEC. 103. WATERSHED PILOT PROJECTS.

(a) *PILOT PROJECTS.*—Section 122 (33 U.S.C. 1274) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking “WET WEATHER”; and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “wet weather discharge”; and

(B) in paragraph (2) by striking “in reducing such pollutants” and all that follows before the period at the end and inserting “to manage, reduce, treat, or reuse municipal stormwater, including low-impact development technologies”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) *WATERSHED PARTNERSHIPS.*—Efforts of municipalities and property owners to demonstrate cooperative ways to address nonpoint sources of pollution to reduce adverse impacts on water quality.”.

(b) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—Section 122(c)(1) is amended by striking “for fiscal year 2004” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2012”.

(c) *REPORT TO CONGRESS.*—Section 122(d) is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “10 years”.

TITLE II—CONSTRUCTION OF TREATMENT WORKS

SEC. 201. SEWAGE COLLECTION SYSTEMS.

Section 211 (33 U.S.C. 1291) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and all that follows through “(a) No” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 211. SEWAGE COLLECTION SYSTEMS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No”;

(2) in subsection (b) by inserting “POPULATION DENSITY.—” after “(b)”;

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) REPLACEMENT AND MAJOR REHABILITATION.—Notwithstanding the requirement of subsection (a)(1) concerning the existence of a collection system as a condition of eligibility, a project for replacement or major rehabilitation of a collection system existing on January 1, 2007, shall be eligible for a grant under this title if the project otherwise meets the requirements of subsection (a)(1) and meets the requirement of paragraph (3).

“(2) NEW SYSTEMS.—Notwithstanding the requirement of subsection (a)(2) concerning the existence of a community as a condition of eligibility, a project for a new collection system to serve a community existing on January 1, 2007, shall be eligible for a grant under this title if the project otherwise meets the requirements of subsection (a)(2) and meets the requirement of paragraph (3).

“(3) REQUIREMENT.—A project meets the requirement of this paragraph if the purpose of the project is to accomplish the objectives, goals, and policies of this Act by addressing an adverse environmental condition existing on the date of enactment of this paragraph.”.

SEC. 202. TREATMENT WORKS DEFINED.

Section 212(2)(A) (33 U.S.C. 1292(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “any works, including site”;

(2) by striking “is used for ultimate” and inserting “will be used for ultimate”; and

(3) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and acquisition of other lands, and interests in lands, which are necessary for construction”.

SEC. 203. POLICY ON COST EFFECTIVENESS.

Section 218(a) (33 U.S.C. 1298(a)) is amended by striking “combination of devices and systems” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “treatment works that meets the requirements of this Act. The system may include water efficiency measures and devices.”.

TITLE III—STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING FUNDS**SEC. 301. GENERAL AUTHORITY FOR CAPITALIZATION GRANTS.**

Section 601(a) (33 U.S.C. 1381(a)) is amended by striking “for providing assistance” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “to accomplish the objectives, goals, and policies of this Act by providing assistance for projects and activities identified in section 603(c).”.

SEC. 302. CAPITALIZATION GRANT AGREEMENTS.

(a) REPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE ASSETS.—Section 602(b)(9) (33 U.S.C. 1382(b)(9)) is amended by striking “standards” and inserting “standards, including standards relating to the reporting of infrastructure assets”.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 602(b) (33 U.S.C. 1382(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (9);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(11) the State will establish, maintain, invest, and credit the fund with repayments, such that the fund balance will be available in perpetuity for providing financial assistance in accordance with this title;

“(12) any fees charged by the State to recipients of assistance will be used for the purpose of financing the cost of administering the fund or financing projects or activities eligible for assistance from the fund;

“(13) beginning in fiscal year 2009, the State will include as a condition of providing assist-

ance to a municipality or intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency that the recipient of such assistance certify, in a manner determined by the Governor of the State, that the recipient—

“(A) has studied and evaluated the cost and effectiveness of innovative and alternative processes, materials, techniques, and technologies for carrying out the proposed project or activity for which assistance is sought under this title, and has selected, to the extent practicable, a project or activity that may result in greater environmental benefits or equivalent environmental benefits when compared to standard processes, materials, techniques, and technologies and more efficiently uses energy and natural and financial resources; and

“(B) has considered, to the maximum extent practical and as determined appropriate by the recipient, the costs and effectiveness of other design, management, and financing approaches for carrying out a project or activity for which assistance is sought under this title, taking into account the cost of operating and maintaining the project or activity over its life, as well as the cost of constructing the project or activity;

“(14) the State will use at least 15 percent of the amount of each capitalization grant received by the State under this title after September 30, 2007, to provide assistance to municipalities of fewer than 10,000 individuals that meet the affordability criteria established by the State under section 603(i)(2) for activities included on the State’s priority list established under section 603(g), to the extent that there are sufficient applications for such assistance;

“(15) treatment works eligible under section 603(c)(1) which will be constructed in whole or in part with funds made available under section 205(m) or by a State water pollution control revolving fund under this title, or both, will meet the requirements of, or otherwise be treated (as determined by the Governor of the State) under sections 204(b)(1), 211, 218, and 511(c)(1) in the same manner as treatment works constructed with assistance under title II of this Act;

“(16) a contract to be carried out using funds directly made available by a capitalization grant under this title for program management, construction management, feasibility studies, preliminary engineering, design, engineering, surveying, mapping, or architectural related services shall be negotiated in the same manner as a contract for architectural and engineering services is negotiated under chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code, or an equivalent State qualifications-based requirement (as determined by the Governor of the State); and

“(17) the requirements of section 513 will apply to the construction of treatment works carried out in whole or in part with assistance made available by a State water pollution control revolving fund as authorized under this title, or with assistance made available under section 205(m), or both, in the same manner as treatment works for which grants are made under this Act.”.

SEC. 303. WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS.

(a) PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—Section 603(c) (33 U.S.C. 1383(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—The amounts of funds available to each State water pollution control revolving fund shall be used only for providing financial assistance—

“(1) to any municipality or intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency for construction of publicly owned treatment works;

“(2) for the implementation of a management program established under section 319;

“(3) for development and implementation of a conservation and management plan under section 320;

“(4) for the implementation of lake protection programs and projects under section 314;

“(5) for repair or replacement of decentralized wastewater treatment systems that treat domestic sewage;

“(6) for measures to manage, reduce, treat, or reuse municipal stormwater;

“(7) to any municipality or intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency for measures to reduce the demand for publicly owned treatment works capacity through water conservation, efficiency, or reuse;

“(8) for measures to increase the security of publicly owned treatment works; and

“(9) for the development and implementation of watershed projects meeting the criteria set forth in section 122.”.

(b) EXTENDED REPAYMENT PERIOD.—Section 603(d)(1) (33 U.S.C. 1383(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking “20 years” and inserting “the lesser of 30 years or the design life of the project to be financed with the proceeds of the loan”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking “not later than 20 years after project completion” and inserting “upon the expiration of the term of the loan”.

(c) FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY PLAN.—Section 603(d)(1) (33 U.S.C. 1383(d)(1)) is further amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by inserting “and” at the end of subparagraph (D); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) for any portion of a treatment works proposed for repair, replacement, or expansion, and eligible for assistance under section 603(c)(1), the recipient of a loan will develop and implement a fiscal sustainability plan that includes—

“(i) an inventory of critical assets that are a part of that portion of the treatment works;

“(ii) an evaluation of the condition and performance of inventoried assets or asset groupings; and

“(iii) a plan for maintaining, repairing, and, as necessary, replacing that portion of the treatment works and a plan for funding such activities.”.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 603(d)(7) (33 U.S.C. 1383(d)(7)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, \$400,000 per year, or 1/5 percent per year of the current valuation of the fund, whichever amount is greatest, plus the amount of any fees collected by the State for such purpose regardless of the source”.

(e) TECHNICAL AND PLANNING ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL SYSTEMS.—Section 603(d) (33 U.S.C. 1383(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) to provide owners and operators of treatment works that serve a population of 10,000 or fewer with technical and planning assistance and assistance in financial management, user fee analysis, budgeting, capital improvement planning, facility operation and maintenance, equipment replacement, repair schedules, and other activities to improve wastewater treatment plant management and operations; except that such amounts shall not exceed 2 percent of grant awards to such fund under this title.”.

(f) ADDITIONAL SUBSIDIZATION.—Section 603 (33 U.S.C. 1383) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) ADDITIONAL SUBSIDIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which a State provides assistance to a municipality or intermunicipal, interstate, or State agency under subsection (d), the State may provide additional subsidization, including forgiveness of principal and negative interest loans—

“(A) to benefit a municipality that—

“(i) meets the State’s affordability criteria established under paragraph (2); or

“(ii) does not meet the State’s affordability criteria if the recipient—

“(I) seeks additional subsidization to benefit individual ratepayers in the residential user rate class;

“(II) demonstrates to the State that such ratepayers will experience a significant hardship from the increase in rates necessary to finance the project or activity for which assistance is sought; and

“(III) ensures, as part of an assistance agreement between the State and the recipient, that the additional subsidization provided under this paragraph is directed through a user charge rate system (or other appropriate method) to such ratepayers; or

“(B) to implement an innovative or alternative process, material, technique, or technology (including low-impact technologies nonstructural protection of surface waters, a new or improved method of waste treatment, and nutrient pollutant trading) that may result in greater environmental benefits, or equivalent environmental benefits at reduced cost, when compared to a standard process, material, technique, or technology.

“(2) AFFORDABILITY CRITERIA.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—On or before September 30, 2008, and after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, a State shall establish affordability criteria to assist in identifying municipalities that would experience a significant hardship raising the revenue necessary to finance a project or activity eligible for assistance under section 603(c)(1) if additional subsidization is not provided. Such criteria shall be based on income data, population trends, and other data determined relevant by the State.

“(B) EXISTING CRITERIA.—If a State has previously established, after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, affordability criteria that meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), the State may use the criteria for the purposes of this subsection. For purposes of this Act, any such criteria shall be treated as affordability criteria established under this paragraph.

“(C) INFORMATION TO ASSIST STATES.—The Administrator may publish information to assist States in establishing affordability criteria under subparagraph (A).

“(3) PRIORITY.—A State may give priority to a recipient for a project or activity eligible for funding under section 603(c)(1) if the recipient meets the State's affordability criteria.

“(4) SET-ASIDE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In any fiscal year in which the Administrator has available for obligation more than \$1,000,000,000 for the purposes of this title, a State shall provide additional subsidization under this subsection in the amount specified in subparagraph (B) to eligible entities described in paragraph (1) for projects and activities identified in the State's intended use plan prepared under section 606(c) to the extent that there are sufficient applications for such assistance.

“(B) AMOUNT.—In a fiscal year described in subparagraph (A), a State shall set aside for purposes of subparagraph (A) an amount not less than 25 percent of the difference between—

“(i) the total amount that would have been allotted to the State under section 604 for such fiscal year if the amount available to the Administrator for obligation under this title for such fiscal year had been equal to \$1,000,000,000; and

“(ii) the total amount allotted to the State under section 604 for such fiscal year.

“(5) LIMITATION.—The total amount of additional subsidization provided under this subsection by a State may not exceed 30 percent of the total amount of capitalization grants received by the State under this title in fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2007.”

SEC. 304. ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 604(a) (33 U.S.C. 1384(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) ALLOTMENTS.—

“(1) FISCAL YEARS 2008 AND 2009.—Sums appropriated to carry out this title for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009 shall be allotted by the Ad-

ministrator in accordance with the formula used to allot sums appropriated to carry out this title for fiscal year 2007.

“(2) FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND THEREAFTER.—Sums appropriated to carry out this title for fiscal year 2010 and each fiscal year thereafter shall be allotted by the Administrator as follows:

“(A) Amounts that do not exceed \$1,350,000,000 shall be allotted in accordance with the formula described in paragraph (1).

“(B) Amounts that exceed \$1,350,000,000 shall be allotted in accordance with the formula developed by the Administrator under subsection (d).”

(b) PLANNING ASSISTANCE.—Section 604(b) (33 U.S.C. 1384(b)) is amended by striking “1 percent” and inserting “2 percent”.

(c) FORMULA.—Section 604 (33 U.S.C. 1384) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) FORMULA BASED ON WATER QUALITY NEEDS.—Not later than September 30, 2009, and after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, the Administrator shall publish an allotment formula based on water quality needs in accordance with the most recent survey of needs developed by the Administrator under section 516(b).”

SEC. 305. INTENDED USE PLAN.

(a) INTEGRATED PRIORITY LIST.—Section 603(g) (33 U.S.C. 1383(g)) is amended to read as follows:

“(g) PRIORITY LIST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2009 and each fiscal year thereafter, a State shall establish or update a list of projects and activities for which assistance is sought from the State's water pollution control revolving fund. Such projects and activities shall be listed in priority order based on the methodology established under paragraph (2). The State may provide financial assistance from the State's water pollution control revolving fund only with respect to a project or activity included on such list. In the case of projects and activities eligible for assistance under section 603(c)(2), the State may include a category or subcategory of nonpoint sources of pollution on such list in lieu of a specific project or activity.

“(2) METHODOLOGY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and after providing notice and opportunity for public comment, each State (acting through the State's water quality management agency and other appropriate agencies of the State) shall establish a methodology for developing a priority list under paragraph (1).

“(B) PRIORITY FOR PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES THAT ACHIEVE GREATEST WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.—In developing the methodology, the State shall seek to achieve the greatest degree of water quality improvement, taking into consideration the requirements of section 602(b)(5) and section 603(i)(3) and whether such water quality improvements would be realized without assistance under this title.

“(C) CONSIDERATIONS IN SELECTING PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.—In determining which projects and activities will achieve the greatest degree of water quality improvement, the State shall consider—

“(i) information developed by the State under sections 303(d) and 305(b);

“(ii) the State's continuing planning process developed under section 303(e);

“(iii) the State's management program developed under section 319; and

“(iv) conservation and management plans developed under section 320.

“(D) NONPOINT SOURCES.—For categories or subcategories of nonpoint sources of pollution that a State may include on its priority list under paragraph (1), the State may consider the cumulative water quality improvements associated with projects or activities in such categories or subcategories.

“(E) EXISTING METHODOLOGIES.—If a State has previously developed, after providing notice

and an opportunity for public comment, a methodology that meets the requirements of this paragraph, the State may use the methodology for the purposes of this subsection.”

(b) INTENDED USE PLAN.—Section 606(c) (33 U.S.C. 1386(c)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “each State shall annually prepare” and inserting “each State (acting through the State's water quality management agency and other appropriate agencies of the State) shall annually prepare and publish”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) the State's priority list developed under section 603(g);”

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “and (6)” and inserting “(6), (15), and (17)”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(4) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting “; and”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) if the State does not fund projects and activities in the order of the priority established under section 603(g), an explanation of why such a change in order is appropriate.”

(c) TRANSITIONAL PROVISION.—Before completion of a priority list based on a methodology established under section 603(g) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as amended by this section), a State shall continue to comply with the requirements of sections 603(g) and 606(c) of such Act, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 306. ANNUAL REPORTS.

Section 606(d) (33 U.S.C. 1386(d)) is amended by inserting “the eligible purpose under section 603(c) for which the assistance is provided,” after “loan amounts.”

SEC. 307. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Title VI (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 607 as section 608; and

(2) by inserting after section 606 the following:

“SEC. 607. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

“(a) SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall assist the States in establishing simplified procedures for treatment works to obtain assistance under this title.

“(b) PUBLICATION OF MANUAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this section, and after providing notice and opportunity for public comment, the Administrator shall publish a manual to assist treatment works in obtaining assistance under this title and publish in the Federal Register notice of the availability of the manual.

“(c) COMPLIANCE CRITERIA.—At the request of any State, the Administrator, after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, shall assist in the development of criteria for a State to determine compliance with the conditions of funding assistance established under sections 602(b)(13) and 603(d)(1)(E).”

SEC. 308. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 608 (as redesignated by section 307 of this Act) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

“(1) \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

“(2) \$3,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2009;

“(3) \$4,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2010; and

“(4) \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2011.”

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. DEFINITION OF TREATMENT WORKS.

Section 502 (33 U.S.C. 1362) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(25) TREATMENT WORKS.—The term ‘treatment works’ has the meaning given that term in section 212.”

SEC. 402. FUNDING FOR INDIAN PROGRAMS.

Section 518(c) (33 U.S.C. 1377) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(1) FISCAL YEARS 1987–2006.—The Administrator”;

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—
(A) by inserting “and ending before October 1, 2006,” after “1986,”; and

(B) by striking the second sentence; and
(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND THEREAFTER.—For fiscal year 2007 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Administrator shall reserve, before allotments to the States under section 604(a), not less than 0.5 percent and not more than 1.5 percent of the funds made available to carry out title VI.

“(3) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds reserved under this subsection shall be available only for grants for projects and activities eligible for assistance under section 603(c) to serve—

“(A) Indian tribes;

“(B) former Indian reservations in Oklahoma (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior); and

“(C) Native villages (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602)).”.

TITLE V—STUDIES

SEC. 501. STUDY OF LONG-TERM, SUSTAINABLE, CLEAN WATER FUNDING.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall commence a study of the funding mechanisms and funding sources available to establish a Clean Water Trust Fund.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an analysis of potential revenue sources that can be efficiently collected, are broad based, are related to water quality, and that support the annual funding levels authorized by the amendments made by this Act.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Comptroller General, at a minimum, shall consult with Federal, State, and local agencies, representatives of business and industry, representatives of entities operating publicly owned treatment works, and other interested groups.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2008, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

SEC. 502. FEASIBILITY STUDY OF SUPPLEMENTAL AND ALTERNATIVE CLEAN WATER FUNDING MECHANISMS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall commence a study of funding mechanisms and funding sources potentially available for wastewater infrastructure and other water pollution control activities under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(b) CONTENTS.—The study shall include an analysis of funding and investment mechanisms and revenue sources from other potential supplemental or alternative public or private sources that could be used to fund wastewater infrastructure and other water pollution control activities under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Comptroller General, at a minimum, shall consult with Federal, State, and local agencies, representatives of business, industry, and financial investment entities, representatives of entities operating treatment works, and other interested groups.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2008, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

TITLE VI—TONNAGE DUTIES

SEC. 601. TONNAGE DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 60301 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking “taxes” and inserting “duties”;

(2) by amending subsections (a) and (b) to read as follows:

“(a) LOWER RATE.—

“(1) IMPOSITION OF DUTY.—A duty is imposed at the rate described in paragraph (2) at each entry in a port of the United States of—

“(A) a vessel entering from a foreign port or place in North America, Central America, the West Indies Islands, the Bahama Islands, the Bermuda Islands, or the coast of South America bordering the Caribbean Sea; or

“(B) a vessel returning to the same port or place in the United States from which it departed, and not entering the United States from another port or place, except—

“(i) a vessel of the United States;

“(ii) a recreational vessel (as defined in section 2101 of this title); or

“(iii) a barge.

“(2) RATE.—The rate referred to in paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) 4.5 cents per ton (but not more than a total of 22.5 cents per ton per year) for fiscal years 2006 through 2007;

“(B) 9.0 cents per ton (but not more than a total of 45 cents per ton per year) for fiscal years 2008 through 2017; and

“(C) 2 cents per ton (but not more than a total of 10 cents per ton per year) for each fiscal year thereafter.

“(b) HIGHER RATE.—

“(1) IMPOSITION OF DUTY.—A duty is imposed at the rate described in paragraph (2) on a vessel at each entry in a port of the United States from a foreign port or place not named in subsection (a)(1).

“(2) RATE.—The rate referred to in paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) 13.5 cents per ton (but not more than a total of 67.5 cents per ton per year) for fiscal years 2006 through 2007;

“(B) 27 cents per ton (but not more than a total of \$1.35 per ton per year) for fiscal years 2008 through 2017; and

“(C) 6 cents per ton (but not more than a total of 30 cents per ton per year) for each fiscal year thereafter.”; and

(3) in subsection (c) by striking “taxes” and inserting “duties”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such title is further amended—

(1) by striking the heading for subtitle VI and inserting the following:

“**Subtitle VI—Clearance and Tonnage Duties**”;

(2) in the headings of sections in chapter 603, by striking “TAXES” each place it appears and inserting “DUTIES”;

(3) in the heading for subsection (a) of section 60303, by striking “TAX” and inserting “DUTY”;

(4) in the text of sections in chapter 603, by striking “taxes” each place it appears and inserting “duties”; and

(5) in the text of sections in chapter 603, by striking “tax” each place it appears and inserting “duty”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Such title is further amended—

(1) in the title analysis by striking the item relating to subtitle VI and inserting the following:

“**VI. CLEARANCE AND TONNAGE DUTIES** **60101**”;

and

(2) in the analysis for chapter 603—

(A) by striking the items relating to sections 60301 and 60302 and inserting the following:

“60301. Regular tonnage duties.

“60302. Special tonnage duties.”; and

and

(B) by striking the item relating to section 60304 and inserting the following:

“60304. Presidential suspension of tonnage duties and light money.”.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each further amendment

may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110-36.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. STUPAK:

At the end of title V of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 503. GREAT LAKES WATER QUALITY.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Government of Canada, shall conduct a study of the condition of wastewater treatment facilities located in the United States and Canada that discharge into the Great Lakes.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study, the Administrator shall—

(1) determine the effect that such treatment facilities have on Great Lakes water quality; and

(2) develop recommendations—

(A) to improve water quality monitoring by the operators of such treatment facilities;

(B) to establish a protocol for improved notification and information sharing between the United States and Canada; and

(C) to promote cooperation between the United States and Canada to prevent the discharge of untreated and undertreated waste into the Great Lakes.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Administrator shall consult with the International Joint Commission and Federal, State, and local governments.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study, together with the recommendations developed under subsection (b)(2).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order. I rise today to continue to protect the Great Lakes, as it is the source of drinking water for 45 million people and the recreational and economic livelihood of the region which depends heavily on a healthy Great Lakes.

There are a large number of wastewater facilities in both the United States and Canada that discharge treated and untreated sewer water into the Great Lakes. While these facilities do everything they can to prevent polluting the Great Lakes, there are times

when untreated or undertreated wastewater is released.

Once this pollution occurs, it can be difficult to determine that a wastewater treatment facility is the source, the effects of these discharges on the Great Lakes, and the steps needed to stop the pollution and clean up any damage.

□ 1200

For example, Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada, have faced tremendous problems with *E. coli*, coliform, and other bacteria in the water near a wastewater treatment facility in Ontario, Canada. These two cities are separated by the St. Mary's River, which connects Lake Superior to Lake Huron.

Under the direction of the EPA, the Chippewa County, Michigan, Health Department has undertaken significant monitoring of the St. Mary's River. The Ontario Ministry of Environment has also begun testing.

However, because there is disagreement about the source of the pollution, there is little to be done to correct the issue. Even though both sides are now beginning to monitor the river, a lack of communication and cooperation still presents a significant roadblock in accomplishing a solution.

My amendment would require the EPA, in consultation with the State Department and the Canadian government, to study wastewater treatment facilities that discharge into the Great Lakes. The study would include recommendations on ways to improve monitoring, information sharing and cooperation between the United States and Canada. The U.S. and Canada must work together to limit harmful wastewater discharges into the Great Lakes.

My amendment will allow the EPA to offer solutions to the notice, protocol and information sharing problems the U.S. and Canada face. By improving monitoring and communication, the U.S. and Canada can work together to solve problems created by wastewater treatment facilities discharging into the Great Lakes. The Congressional Budget Office has indicated there will not be any direct spending as a result of my amendment.

I wish to thank the staff of Transportation and Infrastructure Committee as well as the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee and my personal staff for their assistance in crafting this amendment. I look forward to continuing with them as this legislation moves forward.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I would yield time to the chairman of

the full committee if he so chooses to claim time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman very much for his courtesy and if he would yield 3 minutes?

Mr. BAKER. Certainly.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman.

Twenty years ago, March 3, 1987, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Clinger, the Republican ranking member on the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, which I had the privilege of chairing, and I held a hearing on this very subject, on the U.S.-Canada Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. We observed the agreement was signed in 1972 and renewed in 1978.

It continues in perpetuity, but we observed, while progress has been made, while the Cuyahoga River no longer catches on fire, the bad news is that a great deal of that improvement is due to economic decline in the steel industry. Industries that formerly dumped waste are no longer operating.

Fish are able to survive, but now they are surviving with cancers. Some areas of the lakes where birds are deformed because of Toxiphen and Dieldrin. Mr. Clinger and I both observed the real test of our commitment is yet to come. Will we break out of the planning and research cycle, which we have failed to do in the case of acid rain, and begin to implement protective measures which would strengthen the laws and effective remedial programs.

Some of that has been accomplished in the ensuing years. The gentleman's proposal would move us further along during this Great Lakes week that we are celebrating on Capitol Hill with our colleagues throughout the Great Lakes States. The amendment would require the Administrator of EPA, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the governor of Canada, to identify problems with the wastewater infrastructure on both sides of the Great Lakes, develop recommendations for increased notification of overflows and increased cooperation. Those are all good and valid and important initiatives which we have pursued in a bipartisan effort within our committee for, as I said, over 20 years.

The gentleman's district is the bridge between the upper Lake Superior and the lower lakes. The St. Mary's River moves 130,000 cubic feet per second, and he is astutely vigilant over water quality.

I think accepting this amendment will move the purpose of intergovernmental cooperation further along, and I assure the gentlemen on both sides, I will work with the Committee on Foreign Affairs to fashion this bill, this language further as we go to conference with the other body.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I share the comments of our Chairman. I know of no opposition on our side, and I accordingly yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. STUPAK. Let me thank Mr. BAKER and Mr. OBERSTAR for their help in support of this amendment.

Madam Chairman, we do realize we have to make some minor modifications in this amendment, and I look forward to their continued help and support in that direction. I am always amazed at the knowledge of the chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR, as he went back 20 years to recite language.

He was absolutely right about the flow of the St. Mary's river, 130,000 cubic feet per second. I am always amazed at his knowledge of the Great Lakes and his support for the Great Lakes.

All this amendment is saying is that the U.S. and Canada must work together to prevent harmful discharges into the Great Lakes. My amendment will allow the EPA to offer solutions to notice, protocol and information sharing between our two countries in the face of monitoring, communicating and eventually working together to resolve the problems created by waste charge facilities which discharge treated and untreated water into our Great Lakes. Again, no direct spending will result as a result of my amendment or in the CBO, and I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007, I would like to thank my distinguished colleague, Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, JAMES OBERSTAR, and my friend from Michigan, BART STUPAK, for their work on the Great Lakes Water Quality amendment.

This amendment calls for a study to examine the effect that waste water treatment facilities feeding into the Great Lakes are having on the water quality of the largest fresh water system in the world. I want to commend my good friend from Michigan for raising this important issue. I believe, however, that a study of this kind can only be conducted in collaboration with the Department of State, the International Joint Commission, which is a joint U.S.-Canada border commission, and the Government of Canada itself. We must all recognize that this study cannot be completed without cooperation from our friends north of the border. I hope that as this legislation moves through the legislative process we will be able to examine the role that the International Joint Commission can play in conducting this study and ensuring a bi-national environment open to the research needs of this examination.

I thank Representative STUPAK for bringing this important amendment to the bill. I also wish to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for agreeing to work with the Committee on Foreign Affairs as this legislation moves forward on these issues to ensure the most informative outcome for this important study.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BAKER

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-36.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BAKER:

Page 12, line 9, insert "and" after the semicolon.

Page 12, line 20, strike the semicolon and all that follows before the first period on page 13, line 3.

Page 25, line 3, strike "(6), (15), and (17)" and insert "(6) and (15)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, at this time I would yield 3 minutes to the cosponsor of the amendment, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for working so well together on this amendment.

Madam Chairman, really all this amendment does is it just stops the expansion of the Davis-Bacon, and it says we are not going to move this Davis-Bacon into a revolving fund. That is what the language that is in the underlying bill does, and this amendment simply strikes out the insertion that applies Davis-Bacon.

So what does that really mean is a question that Members need to evaluate when they are thinking about what kinds of services and what kind of work can we get done out there across America. I understand the intensity of the Louisianans here today. They have a lot at stake. That is why we brought this legislation.

In the \$14 billion cumulative total that is part of this overall bill, I know, from hands-on experience being a contractor who has bid projects both ways, Davis-Bacon and merit shop, and my average number is a 20 percent increase; there are numbers out there higher and lower, but 20 percent, this bill wastes at least \$2.8 billion. That could be projects. That could be projects that are going to help the people in this country.

That money is at least wasted, but then it goes into the revolving fund, and it pollutes the rest of those dollars that are in there. So if I do the calculation on this, we come up with a number, it will be about \$280 billion over time; 20 percent of that is \$56 billion. So we are not putting just \$2.8 billion here into the waste bin; we are putting \$56 billion perhaps into the waste bin, Madam Chair, and it keeps us from being able to get these taxpayers' resources into projects that can really help people, especially the people that so desperately need them.

I will tell you from my experience as a contractor who has worked and bid Davis-Bacon projects, I have gone into communities to bid these types of projects and had to do the bid according to the costs that are inflated into them, and had the community look at the overall bid, low bid. And I have

been low bid, have had them reject my bid because it was too high; they couldn't afford it. They would pull the bid back, repackage the package without Davis-Bacon, and I could come in there cheaper, as did my competition, the community went without Federal dollars, as this inflated too much.

These communities went without Federal dollars because it was too expensive to use the Federal funding. That ought to tell us something. As they went back and they funded it out, they bonded it out themselves. They pulled it out of taxes. Sometimes they go back and raise private dollars because of the overall inflation that is imposed by this kind of policy. This is the one that goes in perpetuity.

You mark this revolving fund with this bill. And it isn't just these dollars, it is every single dollar that touches it from this day forward on into the future of the United States until some time comes that this Congress gets a grip, gets a hold of itself and decides we can't afford to be putting this on.

I would add also that as you have an employer and an employee, they agree what to work on. I listen to the gentleman, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, say it will keep them from making enough money to pay their health care. No, it is the other way around. It keeps us from hiring employees in year-round jobs where we provide, as the employer, the health care and retirement benefits because we can only afford to use them under these scales just for the job they have. It is inflationary. It is inefficient.

I would ask for a "yes" vote on the Baker-King amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

This is an issue on which there is a genuine disagreement on both sides of the aisle and within the committee, and a deeply felt view on each side.

I think it is instructive, however, to look at the history of Davis-Bacon, which originated, actually, in 1927, on Long Island, a district represented by Congressman Robert L. Bacon, Republican of New York, who said wages are fair, and there has been no difficulty in the buildings grades between employer and employee for quite some time. But he was upset when a contractor came to him who had bid on construction of a federally funded hospital on Long Island and noted that the contract was awarded to an Alabama firm that came into Long Island with low-wage workers, whom he housed in tents on the property and underbid local contractors.

He said, that's not right, you have to help us stop these underbidding contractors from coming in and taking away local jobs. He, Bacon, introduced legislation that did not inflate wages, as he said, artificially, but assured that

government respects the existing local standard.

A few years, a year later, the Secretary of Labor, James Davis, supported that bill. By March 3, 1931, Davis had left labor, got elected to the Senate, and the two of them authored this legislation. It was signed into law March 3, 1931, by President Herbert Hoover.

Mr. BAKER. May I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes are remaining.

Mr. BAKER. I claim the remaining time.

I certainly respect the chairman's knowledge and views of these matters and appreciate that on 95 percent of the issues before the committee, we are generally in unanimity.

On this particular point, I would like to bring the issue to that of the individual who is trying to rebuild their home in the difficult area of south Louisiana. Materials are short, workmen are hard to find. Do we really want to tell an individual trying to rebuild their personal home, you are going to have to meet a government wage rate in order to build this house or else you cannot build it? This is about government injecting itself into a free market process, all for no apparent reason that is clear to me.

It will make the compliance of the rules for the rural and lower income communities much more difficult to achieve. Compliance with the Davis-Bacon provisions is a difficult and cumbersome task.

□ 1215

And where we have low-income communities, where resources are greatly limited, we are now going to require additional regulatory burden and a higher wage rate that is artificial to further inhibit the ability of that community rebuild. We wouldn't contemplate having that set of requirements on the individual trying to rebuild their own home, but yet we are going to force that set of standards on communities across this Nation, even where States have no Davis-Bacon provisions at the State level at all. And that I think is the most troublesome aspect of the implementation of the proposal as constructed. Eighteen States have chosen not to require a Davis-Bacon implementation, and yet we here in the Congress by virtue of the State revolving infrastructure fund are going to require those States now to comply with these new standards. I hope Members will carefully consider the consequences of this amendment and vote for the Baker-King amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the chair of the subcommittee, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I strongly oppose the Baker-King amendment. I am from a working family, and I stand

with the American workers. The amendment would strip the prevailing wages protection from the bill.

Since 1931, the Davis-Bacon Act has provided a living wage for American workers, and as the authors of the Davis-Bacon Act knew then and as we continue to know today, the greatest way to improve the quality of life for our Nation's workers is for the Nation as a whole to provide workers with an honest living for an honest day's work.

We save nothing when we give people little pay or we pay it through other sources, by more taxes, more welfare rolls. I would much rather have people working.

It has been well documented by this committee that every \$1 billion invested in transportation and water infrastructure creates 40,000 jobs. As of today, 31 States have enacted their own prevailing wage laws of publicly funded construction projects. And you check this with me: Those States that are against it have more poor people than the ones that have it. In some of these States, prevailing wage laws result in even higher wages to workers than if the Federal Davis-Bacon were alone, in effect. Studies have shown that the prevailing wage protections offered by Davis-Bacon in fact attracts better workers with more experience and training who are more productive than the less experienced, less trained workers. So it really saves money in the long run.

We need not to interfere with the Davis-Bacon provision. I support this bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In 1930, as the Davis-Bacon language was being shaped and debated in the Senate and in the House, Senator Davis of Pennsylvania, a Republican, and Congressman Bacon of New York, a Republican, said: The essence is this. Is the government willing, for the sake of the lowest bidder, to break down all labor standards and have its work done by the cheapest labor that can be secured and shipped from State to State?

When the bill was taken up at the Senate, Robert LeFollette, chairman of the Committee on Manufacturers, the Republican chairman of the committee, noted that practices were not only disturbing to labor but disturbing to the business community as well and urged that this measure be speedily enacted. It does not require the government to establish new wage scales; it merely gives the government power to require its contractors to pay the prevailing wage scales in the vicinity of the building projects.

Now, the prevailing wage scale in the vicinity of building projects in Louisiana, for example, an average common laborer gets \$7.86 an hour. That is the prevailing wage. I don't know how you save any more money by going lower than \$7.86 an hour. The average well driller in Louisiana is paid \$11.40 an hour. I don't know how you get much lower than that in order to save money.

This Davis-Bacon provision is prevailing, not union wage. If I could, I would support in law the union wage, but we are not doing that. It is the prevailing local wage. I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF NEW YORK

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 110-36.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. HALL of New York:

Page 23, line 9, strike "and whether such" and insert ", whether such".

Page 23, line 11, insert before the period at the end the following: ", and whether the proposed projects and activities would address water quality impairments associated with existing treatment works".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today with my esteemed colleague from Oregon to offer an amendment that will help communities across the country pay for wastewater projects, protect their environment and preserve their open spaces by combating sprawl.

Today's action on the underlying bill comes not a moment too soon. Nationwide, there is over a \$300 billion shortfall in funding for wastewater projects. In my district, we have \$500 million in projects that can't get funding just because the dollars aren't there.

Communities in the Hudson Valley and elsewhere are also trapped in a battle to balance the booming population with the preservation of water resources and open spaces.

By requiring States to prioritize spending of revolving loan funds of moneys on existing projects, this amendment will help address both of these challenges by helping to bolster existing communities, instead of haphazardly subsidizing the building of new developments.

There is an old adage that says, "Work smarter, not harder." For many

of our rural and suburban and rural communities, the only way to accommodate growth without sacrificing precious open space is to build smarter, not wider. Targeting moneys to projects that will help existing communities provide expanded and improved water treatment will meet that test. Without a smart growth strategy, the loss of open spaces, runoff created by the change from soil to pavement and other impacts will wreak havoc on our environment.

If we don't take aggressive action to make smart growth the guiding principle of development, we will end up squandering our resources, jeopardizing our health, and damaging our economy.

The amendment will also do one thing that I think, quite frankly, the Federal Government should be doing more of, giving property taxpayers and municipalities much needed relief.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of New York. I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I must say I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with him on this amendment.

Madam Chair, it is a pleasure to see the people; I feel a little angst not being on the Transportation Committee, I must say, and I keep gravitating down to the floor because of the important work that is being done.

I deeply appreciate Congressman HALL's work in the water resource area. I know he comes from an area that is challenged in terms of water resources and environmental threats and has long been a leader before he came to Congress. I deeply appreciate his leadership in this regard, and I was pleased to partner with him on this amendment because it will strengthen the bill to target effectiveness and support where the needs are greatest. As Mr. HALL mentioned, there is a deep concern that we target the resources where they will make the most difference.

There is another adage that I would offer up, and that is, "Fix it first." We are dealing with an aging water infrastructure problem that is hundreds of billions of dollars, national in scope. The work that the Transportation Infrastructure Committee has done already in the last 12 weeks is moving us forward on an aggressive agenda. But by being able to target this money in areas where the need is the greatest, not to add to the inventory that is already overloaded, I think is an important area of priority.

I look forward to the approval of this amendment, working with the gentleman, working with the committee, working with our other colleagues. We have massive problems around the country where we need to be focusing; and I note my friend and colleague from Louisiana there, we have got unfinished business there as well. And the extent to which we are able to work in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and in this Congress to be able to put the dollars where they will do the most good is important.

Being able to have thoughtful infrastructure investment in ways that reinforce smart growth, where it needs to be, where it will have the most impact, is an important principle. I am pleased that, with the adoption of this amendment, we will be able to enshrine it in this legislation, and I hope that it finds its way in the work that will come forward with this committee throughout the course of this Congress.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, this language reinforces or adds an additional provision to section 305(b) of the act before us today. Section 602(b) reaffirms the deadlines, goals and requirements of the Clean Water Act, fishable-swimmable water goals. Section 603 deals with the affordability. And we have already prioritized in the basic legislation targeting funds to lower income communities to ensure that they get their fair share. This language will just take that affordability language one step further and impose on States the requirement to give full, fair consideration to projects that deal with immediate needs rather than adding capacity before you consider adding capacity.

Mr. BAKER. Having no objection to the amendment, I yield back all time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PLATTS

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 110-36.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. PLATTS:
Page 12, line 7, insert "204(a)(6)," before "204(b)(1)."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Chair, the adoption of this amendment would help

to ensure sufficient competition among the designers and manufacturers of water and wastewater treatment equipment across the country. It is premised on the idea that small firms ought to have the same chance at bidding on a project as large firms. In addition, with there being a critical need to upgrade our water and sewer infrastructure, requiring States to ensure a full and open competition would likely reduce the cost of the program and help finance additional and much needed projects.

This amendment would simply provide that, "No specification for bids shall be written in such a manner as to contain proprietary, exclusionary or discriminatory requirements other than those based upon performance, unless such requirements are necessary to test or demonstrate a specific thing or to provide for necessary interchangeability of parts and equipment."

The amendment further provides that, "When in the judgment of the grantee, it is impractical or uneconomical to make a clear and accurate description of the technical requirements, a 'brand name or equal' description may be used as a means to define the performance or other salient requirements of a procurement, and in doing so the grantee may not establish existence of any source other than the brand or source so named."

□ 1230

The language found in this amendment is the same competition requirement that was applied to grants provided under title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. While not identical, it is also very similar to a competition requirement adopted by my home State of Pennsylvania for its revolving fund.

I appreciate the Rules Committee having made the amendment in order, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, I rise to ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not in opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would include an additional requirement on State revolving loans on authorities not previously part of the State Revolving Loan Fund Program. The provision of section 204(a)(6) of the Clean Water Act is a longstanding title II construction grants requirement. We don't have construction grants any more, since 1987, that does require "full and open bid competition for the construction of publicly owned treatment works."

The gentleman's amendment would prohibit financial assistance recipients

from including bid specs that contain proprietary, exclusionary, discriminatory requirements, other than those based on performance.

I have asked the staff to review and I, myself, have reviewed the Federal acquisition regulations which are generic to the Federal Government. These requirements for full and open bid competition are in place. They do generically apply to provisions of the Clean Water Act.

However, I think it is appropriate and is not confusing, nor is it in opposition to the Federal acquisition regulations, to include the gentleman's amendment. Therefore, we accept the gentleman's amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's acceptance of the amendment and the work of his staff, as well as the ranking member of the full committee and the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee. And, again, I appreciate their consideration and acceptance of the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. HIRONO

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 110-36.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Ms. HIRONO:
Page 6, line 21, strike the closing quotation marks and the final period.

Page 6, after line 21, insert the following:

"(4) INTEGRATED WATER RESOURCE PLAN.—The development of an integrated water resource plan for the coordinated management and protection of surface water, ground water, and stormwater resources on a watershed or subwatershed basis to meet the objectives, goals, and policies of this Act."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chair, my amendment will add another allowable use of funds under section 103, Watershed Pilot Projects, to assist communities in developing integrated water resource plans for the coordinated management and protection of surface water, ground water and storm water resources on a watershed or subwatershed basis. The amendment does not add to the cost of the bill; it simply provides another option for communities in use of the grants funds.

It is important that communities look at the inner relationship between each of these water systems when devising management and protection plans. Management of storm water can certainly have an impact on the quality of surface waters, and the quality of surface water has an effect on the quality and safety of ground water.

This approach is very much in line with Hawaiian traditions of land management. The traditional Hawaiian land management unit, the ahupua'a, goes from the top of the mountain to the sea. Ancient Hawaiians understood that what happened on the mountain would affect resources at lower elevations, in coastal areas, and even in the ocean. The watershed model of natural resource management is a modern equivalent of the Hawaiian ahupua'a system.

It is important that we move to a more holistic way of looking at how our water systems interact. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment to provide communities with an opportunity to develop such integrated plans.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition and therefore ask for unanimous consent for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Can I ask the gentleman if he could yield me 1 minute.

Mr. BAKER. I would be happy to yield the chairman 1 minute.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I want to thank the gentlelady for her amendment which reinforces a longstanding practice of this committee to deal with water resource needs on a watershed basis.

This watershed pilot project eligibility will greatly advance the cause of clean water and water availability.

The U.S. Geological Survey observed most recently there are clear connections between surface water, ground water, and the precipitation events that reach these areas. In our area, precipitation is snow. In Hawaii and Louisiana, it is rain. And impact on these water resources, whether through unchecked sources of pollution, wastewater, can have significant effects on the sources of water.

So the gentlelady's amendment will give an additional tool for communities to perfect and strengthen their planning for the best use and management of existing water resources, and we are happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers. And having no objection, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chair, I yield back the rest of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 110-36.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. WHITFIELD:

At the end of title I, insert the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 104. POOL ELEVATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, beginning in the first July after the date of enactment of this Act, the Army Corps of Engineers, together with any other Federal agency that has the authority to change the pool elevation of Lake Barkley, Kentucky, shall establish and conduct a pilot program that, under normal weather conditions, extends the summer pool elevation of 359 feet on such lake from the current draw down date of July 1 until after the first Monday in September.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM DURATION.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the pilot program shall terminate on the first Monday in September two years after the pilot program begins.

(c) EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the first Monday in September two years after the pilot program begins, the Chief of Engineers of the Army Corps of Engineers shall evaluate the effectiveness of extending the pool elevation on Lake Barkley, Kentucky, under subsection (a) and report to the appropriate committees of Congress their findings, including any recommendations, regarding the extension of time for such lake elevation.

(d) CONTINUATION.—If the Army Corps of Engineers determines that the pilot program under this section is effective, the Corps shall continue the summer elevation of 359 feet on Lake Barkley, Kentucky, through the first Monday in September each year.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 229, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, I am offering this amendment today to simply create a 2-year pilot program to extend the summer pool at Lake Barkley, which is located in my district in western Kentucky.

Now, I would reiterate that this amendment does not do anything in a permanent nature, but simply asks for a 2-year pilot project.

Lake Barkley is one of those very shallow dams throughout the country. At the summer pool, the level is 359 feet.

Now, when Lake Barkley was created, in order to create it, a number of

small communities in western Kentucky were flooded in the 1960s. And even today, despite the extensive use of this lake, old foundations, streets, highways and railroads are still visible in shallow areas in the lake. And when the Corps begins drawing down the summer pool, moving to the winter pool, they begin on July 1, right in the middle of summer season. As a result of that, it has created an unusually dangerous situation for recreational users of the lake, particularly boaters. And we have had significant and many serious accidents on this lake because of boats hitting tree stumps, old road beds and other obstructions. Just last August, a boating accident occurred, resulting in two fatalities, severely injuring three other people, which is just one example of how dangerous this early lowering of the lake can be.

In addition, recreation at the lake in the summer generates millions of dollars for a lot of small businessmen and women. And as I said, the fact that the Corps begins going to the winter pool in July, it does create significant issues for that area.

And so as I said, this amendment simply asks the Corps to extend that summer pool level of 359 feet from July until around Labor Day.

Now, it is my understanding that the chairman and other members of the committee, through information I received from staff, would prefer that I not offer this amendment today. And I am going to withdraw the amendment. But I would ask the chairman and the other members of the committee to please work with me. I would ask them to work with me to explore opportunities to address this problem in western Kentucky affecting Lake Barkley through either, one, considering my freestanding bill that establishes this 2-year project at the committee, or working with me maybe on the WRDA bill. Or I would not even object if the chairman wanted to consider this at the conference with the Senate.

But I am simply asking, and I will withdraw the amendment, and would ask the chairman and the members of the committee to work with me to try to address this unique problem affecting Lake Barkley.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Would the gentleman yield if he has time remaining?

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The gentleman, in years past, has been very participatory in the work of our committee. Notably, on railroad issues several years ago the gentleman took the lead on a very contentious issue, and we have greatly appreciated his contribution then and want to work with the gentleman.

The amendment would implement the change to the elevation pool before completion of the environmental assessment.

We have the Water Resources Development Act ready, I think, to move within 2 weeks or so. I would like to join with the gentleman in

Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield

| | | |
|-------------|------|------------|
| Wilson (OH) | Wu | Yarmuth |
| Woolsey | Wynn | Young (AK) |

NOT VOTING—18

| | | |
|---------------|-------------|------------|
| Bachus | Ellison | Millender- |
| Bono | Eshoo | McDonald |
| Boren | Fortuño | Moore (WI) |
| Calvert | Hunter | Neugebauer |
| Camp (MI) | Larson (CT) | Nunes |
| Davis, David | Marchant | Reynolds |
| Davis, Jo Ann | | |

□ 1313

Messrs. CHANDLER, ROTHMAN, AL GREEN of Texas, HINCHEY, OBEY and Ms. HOOLEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. EHLERS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 133, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LYNCH) having assumed the chair, Ms. SOLIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 720) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 229, she reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CANTOR

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CANTOR. In its present form, yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cantor moves to recommit the bill H.R. 720 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report back the same forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VII—SECURE MARITIME AND VESSEL WORKFORCE

SEC. 701. PROHIBITION OF ISSUANCE OF TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CARDS TO CONVICTED FELONS.

No individual who has been issued a transportation worker identification card may board a maritime vessel if the individual has been convicted, or found not guilty by reason of insanity, in a civilian or military jurisdiction of any of the following felonies:

(1) Espionage or conspiracy to commit espionage.

(2) Sedition or conspiracy to commit sedition.

(3) Treason or conspiracy to commit treason.

(4) A crime listed in chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, a comparable State law, or conspiracy to commit such crime.

(5) A crime involving a transportation security incident. In this paragraph, a transportation security incident—

(A) is a security incident resulting in a significant loss of life, environmental damage, transportation system disruption, or economic disruption in a particular area (as defined in section 70101 of title 46, United States Code); and

(B) does not include a work stoppage or other nonviolent employee-related action, resulting from an employer-employee dispute.

(6) Improper transportation of a hazardous material under section 5124 of title 49, United States Code, or a comparable State law.

(7) Unlawful possession, use, sale, distribution, manufacture, purchase, receipt, transfer, shipping, transporting, import, export, storage of, or dealing in an explosive or incendiary device (as defined in section 232(5) of title 18, United States Code, explosive materials (as defined in section 841(c) of such title 18), or a destructive device (as defined in 921(a)(4) of such title 18).

(8) Murder.

(9) Conspiracy or attempt to commit any of the crimes described in paragraphs (5) through (8).

(10) A violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (18 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), or a comparable State law, if 1 of the predicate acts found by a jury or admitted by the defendant consists of 1 of the offenses listed in paragraphs (4) and (8).

Mr. CANTOR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I object to dispensing with the reading. We have only just now received this language and I insist on the reading of the language.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued reading the motion to recommit.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is designed to be a substantive enhancement to the underlying Secure Maritime and Vessel Workforce bill.

I think the other side has demonstrated on two occasions this week

that they are inclined to work across the aisle and accept substantive improvements to the bill.

What this motion to recommit does, it is intended to protect our maritime workforce, our national security, and ultimately the ports that serve and provide commerce to our great Nation. The language of the motion to recommit ensures that individuals that have been convicted of felonies are not able to board maritime vessels using transportation security cards. Now these felonies includes espionage, treason, sedition, murder, racketeering, crimes dealing with explosives or incendiary devices. These are individuals convicted of these felonies that frankly have an underlying purpose to harm Americans.

Clearly, individuals convicted of these type of felony crimes pose a security risk to America and its citizens.

We need to keep our ports safe and secure, and to do that, we must keep our maritime vessels safe and secure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the motion, although I don't know whether I am in opposition at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to observe and I appreciate the gentleman's comment about our side accepting amendments from the minority, and we have done that mostly where there has been prior consultation and discussion. In this case, this language was not available to our majority members on the committee until just prior to when it was offered on the floor.

I inquire of the offeror his explanation on page 2, subsection (4), "A crime listed in chapter 113B of title 18," what is that language? Can the gentleman read me the language of the U.S. Code?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I would ask the gentleman to repeat that again.

Mr. OBERSTAR. It is his amendment. On page 2 of the gentleman's amendment, "(4) A crime listed in chapter 113B of title 18, U.S. Code," what does that refer to?

I have been able in just these few minutes to get chapter 113 but not B.

Mr. CANTOR. I would respond to the gentleman that the section cited on page 2, subsection (4), line 1 of the bill, is a section of the U.S. Code dealing with terrorism.

And again, the underlying—

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reclaiming my time, I want to know what the language is. The gentleman is offering an amendment. If he is serious about it, then he ought to have the language.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman again, this is a section of the U.S. Code that deals with acts of terrorism against the United States and its citizens.

The underlying purpose, again, of the motion to recommit is to ensure the safety of our—

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman has not been able to answer my question.

I was the author in our committee of the Port Security Act, along with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). We had carefully crafted language that set standards for security clearance for maritime workers. We did not have any reference to chapter 113B. The transportation security workers card has not yet been issued. The readers for that card have not yet been put in place by the Transportation Security Administration.

The standards, apart from this provision that the gentleman lists here, generally are covered in the background checks required in our Port Security Act for maritime workers.

But this is very vague language in number (4). It is specific to a provision of U.S. Code, but the gentleman cannot explain to me what it is.

And then “(5), A crime involving a transportation security incident,” dropping down to subsection “(A) is a security incident resulting in a significant loss of life,” we don’t know where that language comes from.

Mr. Speaker, we should not amend the Port Security Act on 30 seconds notice. There may be very good and valid provisions of this motion to recommit that we might very well be in support of, but only in due course, only in a proper forum. To come up here 30 seconds before the motion is offered and lay on the body this language without having the backup for it I think is inappropriate, and I object to the process. I object to the procedure that has been followed, not perhaps to the substance of it.

Our committee is fully prepared to deal with this issue in due course and give it full and thorough consideration, but not here, not in this context.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I find it very difficult to understand how the gentleman can refer to an abuse of process on this side of the aisle. I hardly—

Mr. OBERSTAR. You should be very well accustomed to it; you did it for 12 years.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has yielded.

So what we are talking about here is the substantive—

Mr. OBERSTAR. Is the gentleman going to explain 113B?

Mr. CANTOR. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Read it. Read the language.

Mr. CANTOR. I would tell the gentleman, dealt with—

Mr. OBERSTAR. Read it.

I do not yield further. I do not yield further.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ISSA. Point of order. My understanding of the rules is that we cannot have Members speaking to each other. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is this colloquy was not allowed. Mr. Speaker, can we please admonish people to address the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a timely point of order, but it is correct that remarks should be addressed to the Chair and not in the second person.

All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 359, noes 56, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

AYES—359

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito

Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison

Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Henger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa

Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre

McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Obey
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

NOES—56

Abercrombie
Arcuri
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Clarke
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Davis (IL)
Dingell
Doggett
Emanuel
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Green, Gene
Hinchey

Hirono
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Napolitano
Oberstar
Oliver

Pascarell
Payne
Rangel
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Slaughter
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Velázquez
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—18

Bachus
Berman
Boehner
Bono
Boren
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann

Eshoo
Hayes
Hunter
Larson (CT)

Marchant
Millender-
McDonald
Moore (WI)

Neugebauer
Nunes

□ 1408

Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia, MEEKS of New York, GEORGE MILLER of California, SERRANO, TOWNS and Ms. VELAZQUEZ changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. CUELLAR, MCNULTY and PRICE of north carolina, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Messrs. WALZ of MINNESOTA, HARE and LANGEVIN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. FATTAH, BOSWELL, LEVIN, BERRY, LYNCH and SARBANES, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. POMEROY, BRALEY of Iowa, CARDOZA, NEAL of Massachusetts and WU, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, MITCHELL, ELLISON, COHEN, WELCH of Vermont, HOLDEN, SKELTON, VAN HOLLEN and DOYLE, Ms. HARMAN, Messrs. LIPINSKI, COSTELLO, TIERNEY, KIND, LARSEN of Washington, ALLEN, PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, SESTAK, DELAHUNT, ROSS, CAPUANO, KILDEE, CARNAHAN, ISRAEL, MEEK of Florida, PASTOR, UDALL of New Mexico, SCOTT of Georgia, MARKEY, BACA, SCHIFF and RAHALL, Ms. CASTOR, Messrs. MCNERNEY, STUPAK, SIREs, GUTIERREZ, ORTIZ, CUMMINGS, MURPHY of Connecticut, HINOJOSA, OBEY, THOMPSON of California, GRIJALVA, KENNEDY, DICKS, RODRIGUEZ, REYES and ANDREWS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. ACKERMAN, RYAN of Ohio, HASTINGS of Florida, PALLONE, HOLT and MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MATSUL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SOLIS, Messrs. MOLLOHAN, FARR, HIGGINS and MICHAUD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CARSON, Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas, CLEAVER, BLUMENAUER, GONZALEZ, CLAY, RUPPERSBERGER, VISCLOSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COOPER and Mr. SHERMAN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 720, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VII—SECURE MARITIME AND VESSEL WORKFORCE

SEC. 701. PROHIBITION OF ISSUANCE OF TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CARDS TO CONVICTED FELONS.

No individual who has been issued a transportation worker identification card may board a maritime vessel if the individual has been convicted, or found not guilty by reason of insanity, in a civilian or military jurisdiction of any of the following felonies:

(1) Espionage or conspiracy to commit espionage.

(2) Sedition or conspiracy to commit sedition.

(3) Treason or conspiracy to commit treason.

(4) A crime listed in chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, a comparable State law, or conspiracy to commit such crime.

(5) A crime involving a transportation security incident. In this paragraph, a transportation security incident—

(A) is a security incident resulting in a significant loss of life, environmental damage, transportation system disruption, or economic disruption in a particular area (as defined in section 70101 of title 46, United States Code); and

(B) does not include a work stoppage or other nonviolent employee-related action, resulting from an employer-employee dispute.

(6) Improper transportation of a hazardous material under section 5124 of title 49, United States Code, or a comparable State law.

(7) Unlawful possession, use, sale, distribution, manufacture, purchase, receipt, transfer, shipping, transporting, import, export, storage of, or dealing in an explosive or incendiary device (as defined in section 232(5) of title 18, United States Code, explosive materials (as defined in section 841(c) of such title 18), or a destructive device (as defined in 921(a)(4) of such title 18).

(8) Murder.

(9) Conspiracy or attempt to commit any of the crimes described in paragraphs (5) through (8).

(10) A violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (18 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), or a comparable State law, if 1 of the predicate acts found by a jury or admitted by the defendant consists of 1 of the offenses listed in paragraphs (4) and (8).

Mr. OBERSTAR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 303, nays 108, not voting 22, as follows:

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggart
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaiver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez

[Roll No. 135]
YEAS—303

Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)

Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Wasserman | Welch (VT) | Wolf |
| Schultz | Weller | Woolsey |
| Waters | Wexler | Wu |
| Watson | Whitfield | Wynn |
| Watt | Wicker | Yarmuth |
| Waxman | Wilson (NM) | Young (AK) |
| Weiner | Wilson (OH) | Young (FL) |

NAYS—108

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Fox | Mica |
| Akin | Franks (AZ) | Miller (FL) |
| Bachmann | Frelinghuysen | Miller, Gary |
| Barrett (SC) | Garrett (NJ) | Moran (KS) |
| Bartlett (MD) | Gingrey | Musgrave |
| Barton (TX) | Gohmert | Myrick |
| Bilirakis | Goode | Paul |
| Bishop (UT) | Goodlatte | Pearce |
| Blackburn | Granger | Pence |
| Blunt | Hall (TX) | Pitts |
| Bonner | Heller | Poe |
| Boozman | Hensarling | Price (GA) |
| Boustany | Herger | Pryce (OH) |
| Brady (TX) | Hoekstra | Putnam |
| Brown (SC) | Inglis (SC) | Radanovich |
| Buchanan | Issa | Rogers (AL) |
| Burgess | Jindal | Rogers (MI) |
| Campbell (CA) | Johnson, Sam | Royce |
| Cannon | Jordan | Ryan (WI) |
| Cantor | Keller | Sali |
| Carter | King (IA) | Sensenbrenner |
| Chabot | Kingston | Sessions |
| Coble | Kline (MN) | Shadegg |
| Cole (OK) | Knollenberg | Simpson |
| Conaway | Lamborn | Smith (TX) |
| Crenshaw | Latham | Souder |
| Cubin | Lewis (KY) | Stearns |
| Culberson | Linder | Sullivan |
| Davis (KY) | Lucas | Thornberry |
| Davis, Tom | Lungren, Daniel | Tiahrt |
| Deal (GA) | E. | Tiberi |
| Dreier | Mack | Walberg |
| Duncan | Manzullo | Weldon (FL) |
| Everett | McCarthy (CA) | Westmoreland |
| Fallin | McCrery | Wilson (SC) |
| Flake | McHenry | |
| Forbes | McKeon | |

NOT VOTING—22

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|------------|
| Bachus | Davis, Jo Ann | Marchant |
| Berman | Doggett | Millender- |
| Boehner | Emanuel | McDonald |
| Bono | Eshoo | Moore (WI) |
| Boren | Feeney | Neugebauer |
| Calvert | Hayes | Nunes |
| Camp (MI) | Hunter | Tancredo |
| Davis, David | Larson (CT) | |

□ 1418

Mr. ADERHOLT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was not present to cast my votes on rollcall votes 133, 134, and 135 earlier today, March 9, 2007. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Baker Amendment—rollcall 133, "aye" on the Motion to Recommit—rollcall 134, and "nay" on Final Passage of H.R. 720—rollcall 135.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD and regret that I could not be present today, Friday, March 9, 2007, to vote on rollcall votes Nos. 132, 133, 134, and 135, due to a family medical matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall vote No. 132 on H. Res. 229, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 720—Water Quality Financing Act of 2007; "nay" on rollcall vote No. 133, on the amend-

ment to H.R. 720, to strike the Davis-Bacon section of the bill; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 134, on a motion to recommit H.R. 720 with instructions; and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 135, on the final passage of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of Friday, March 9, 2007, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to cast a vote on a number of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall 132—"nay"; rollcall 133—"aye"; rollcall 134—"aye"; and rollcall 135—"nay."

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 202, 110th Congress, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming:

Mr. MARKEY, Massachusetts, Chairman

Mr. BLUMENAUER, Oregon
Mr. INSLEE, Washington
Mr. LARSON, Connecticut
Ms. SOLIS, California
Ms. HERSETH, South Dakota
Mr. CLEAVER, Missouri
Mr. HALL, New York
Mr. MCNERNEY, California
Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Wisconsin
Mr. SHADEGG, Arizona
Mr. WALDEN, Oregon
Mr. SULLIVAN, Oklahoma
Mrs. BLACKBURN, Tennessee
Mrs. MILLER, Michigan

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

Dear Madam Speaker, Given my pending appointment to the House Committee on Financial Services, I hereby tender my resignation from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Sincerely,

KENNY MARCHANT,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. CURTIS, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 342. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the "Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse".

H.R. 544. An act to designate the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the "Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse".

H.R. 584. An act to designate the Federal building located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwest in the District of Columbia as the "Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building".

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the re-appointment of Guy Rocha of Nevada to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the minority whip for yielding. On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour business and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. There will be no votes, Madam Speaker, on Monday before 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour business, and noon for legislative business. We will consider additional bills under suspension of the rules, and a complete list of those bills for the week will be announced by the close of business today.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. We will consider several important pieces of open government and accountability legislation from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee: H.R. 1309, the Freedom of Information Act and amendments; H.R. 1255, Presidential Records Act Amendments; H.R. 1254, Presidential Library Donation Reform Act; H.R. 985, Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act; and H.R. 1362, Accountability in Contracting Act.

Notwithstanding everybody is requesting to meet next Friday, we are not going to do that.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for sticking with his earlier decision on next Friday, in spite of what I am sure must have been the incredible pressure for us to be here next Friday; and we will try to get our work done.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Nobody in the House, other than yourself and Mr. BOEHNER, know that pressure more than I.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate the gentleman's view of that, and he is right. I do share it. I would ask the gentleman, on the supplemental that has been described in concept this week, when

would we expect to see language on the supplemental?

Mr. HOYER. The supplemental I expect to be marked up in committee. We have moved it one week, as the gentleman knows, as we have worked on trying to get language that is appropriate language from the perspective of the committee. And Mr. OBEY has been working very hard on that, as have others. I expect that to be marked up next week, and I expect the language to be available early next week.

Mr. BLUNT. And the gentleman then would expect it to be on the floor the following week?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. BLUNT. You expect it to be on the floor the following week?

Mr. HOYER. I believe that is the week of the 19th.

Mr. BLUNT. That would be the week of the 19th.

Mr. HOYER. Yes, sir. I expect the supplemental to be on the floor the week of the 19th, and then we are very hopeful that the budget will be on the floor the week of the 26th.

Mr. BLUNT. And as an appropriations bill, does the gentleman anticipate that we will have opportunities to amend that bill on the floor?

Mr. HOYER. We don't know that yet. We are discussing that. I don't know yet.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I would just say before I move to my next question, of course, this is, as we all know, an important and at the same time controversial piece of legislation, and we would hope for a full debate and an opportunity to have a chance to amend the bill on the floor.

The leader also announced, I believe, this week, maybe it was late last week, that we should anticipate seeing legislation on the floor within the month on allowing the Delegate from D.C. to vote on the floor. I wonder if the leader could tell us a little more about his idea on what this proposal would include.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the question. As you know, I feel very strongly that the representative of the District of Columbia should have full voting membership in the House of Representatives, as does the representative in parliament of, I believe, every other capital of every other democracy in the world, except for the District of Columbia.

I expect that legislation, and hope that legislation, will be on the floor before we adjourn for the Easter work period, which would probably mean the week of the 26th. The legislation is the legislation, as you know, that is sponsored by Mr. DAVIS, TOM DAVIS, the Republican former chairman of your campaign committee, but more importantly, the former chairman of the Government Reform Committee, and cosponsored by Mrs. NORTON, the representative of the District of Columbia.

I would expect that legislation to include, as the original legislation included, an additional Member from Utah and full voting rights being extended, and full membership as a full Member, both of the new Utah Representative, but also of the Representative of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLUNT. Does the gentleman know when that legislation was designed to take effect? After the next election? I am not familiar with the specifics of that legislation. Certainly I do know that Mr. DAVIS was the sponsor.

Mr. HOYER. The hearings I expect to be held next week, I believe. Hearings and markup, I think, will be next week, so I can't tell you exactly, obviously, because it hasn't been marked up yet. But it is my contemplation that there would be a special election in the case of the District of Columbia Representative, and in the case of the Utah Representative.

As we all know, the only way you can get to be a Member of this House is to be elected. There are no appointments to this, so that we would contemplate providing for a special election for both.

Mr. BLUNT. In our Constitution, as the gentleman knows, the District was established differently than most capitals and, I am sure, has developed in a different way than was anticipated at the time.

But when Presidential voting rights were extended to the District, the Constitution had to be amended to do that.

Would the gentleman anticipate that this would also require a constitutional amendment since the District is not part of any State?

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As you know, Mr. DAVIS is the author of this bill. He had extensive hearings on this bill, as you know, in the last Congress; reported this bill out in the last Congress. It was never brought to the floor, but it was reported out.

And as you know, it was Mr. DAVIS' and the committee's conclusion that this could be effected by legislation, as has been the admission of States to the Union, and the admission, therefore, of new voting Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Now, I don't represent that there is not another view as to whether or not you can do this statutorily or whether you need to do it constitutionally. But I can tell you, as you well know, that it was Mr. DAVIS' conclusion, the committee's conclusion, under his leadership when your party was in control of the House, and it was the conclusion of the committee that it could be done statutorily, and we are proceeding on that theory.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I would caution the gentleman on that theory. As high a regard as I have for Mr. DAVIS, and it is high, I have certainly never consid-

ered him to be the ultimate authority on the Constitution. And, of course, when you allow States to enter the Union, as the Constitution provides for, you have the requisite number of Members of the House and two Members of the Senate.

And the major question I am sure I will have during that debate and later will be exactly what State is Washington, D.C. part of, since the Constitution specifically says that Members of the House are selected by the various States.

I think there is a constitutional question here, and that is one of the reasons that, when we were in the majority, that Mr. DAVIS' bill didn't come to the floor. And I think there will be, should be, a constitutional remedy, if there is a remedy.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield before we go on to a different subject?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I would ask my friend, would the gentleman be for a constitutional amendment if such an amendment were brought to the floor?

Mr. BLUNT. I might be for whatever it took to return the voting rights for the Member of Congress to a State that is represented by two Senators which, of course, would be, I would assume, your State.

I don't know that I would be for an amendment that would allow somebody to be represented uniquely that doesn't have Senatorial representation, and, of course, you are assuming that it would be inside the Constitution. I do think that would be the way to do it.

And while the population of the District may allow it to have a population similar to the districts that are represented by the average Member in terms of population, the Constitution, to me, appears to be very explicit on the question of Representatives of a State.

Half of the original District of Columbia, as the gentleman knows, was returned to the State of Virginia in, I believe, the 1840s. They are represented by a Member of Congress, and maybe more than one, and they are represented by two Senators, the Senators from Virginia. That appears to me to be a remedy that would be well within the Constitution. But this proposal that Mr. DAVIS and others have made, I think, will have a significant constitutional hurdle to overcome.

The other question I would direct to the gentleman is on the budget itself. When does the majority expect that we will see a markup in committee of the budget resolution, and when would that resolution be on the floor?

Mr. HOYER. I would expect a markup, certainly this is the target for markup, the week of the 19th and on the floor the week of the 26th.

Mr. BLUNT. So you are anticipating, if I could refresh my mind here to the gentleman's comments, that both the supplemental appropriations bill and the budget will be marked up during the week of the 19th.

Mr. HOYER. No, I expect the supplemental to be marked up in committee next week.

Mr. BLUNT. Next week. And on the floor the week of the 19th.

Mr. HOYER. And on the floor the week of the 19th.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, it is a good thing I clarified that in my mind.

Mr. HOYER. So you would have on the week of the 19th the supplemental and on the week of the 26th the budget on the floor.

□ 1430

Mr. BLUNT. As I recall, that is exactly what the leader suggested, and now I have that straight in my mind, and those will be weeks that we would hope to have a full debate and important debate for the country.

I thank my friend for the information he has provided.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SPECIALIST BLAKE HARRIS

(Mr. SALAZAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, yesterday we resumed reading the names of our servicemembers on this House floor that have paid the ultimate sacrifice in this war. To date, 3,188 American servicemembers have lost their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I am greatly saddened today to add the name of Specialist Blake Harris to that list of the fallen soldiers.

Specialist Harris was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 12th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas.

Specialist Harris died on Monday, March 5, in Baqubah, Iraq, of injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near his patrol.

Blake Harris was born and raised in Pueblo, Colorado. He was a 2002 graduate of Pueblo South High School.

In Pueblo, Blake leaves behind a loving wife, Joanna; a 2-year-old son, Jonah; and his mother, Deborah Harris. He is also survived by his father, John Harris of Denver.

Madam Speaker, I extend my heartfelt sympathy and condolences to his family and friends who have suffered this loss, and I pray for their comfort and strength in their time of greatest need.

Specialist Harris was a proud and courageous soldier whose story must never be forgotten. Blake Harris was 22 years old.

Madam Speaker, I submit this recognition to the United States House of Representatives in honor of his sacrifice so that the memory of Blake Harris may live on forever.

CALLING FOR REAL BORDER SECURITY AND ENFORCEMENT

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, yesterday afternoon in western North Carolina, a routine traffic stop netted 11 illegal immigrants. How do we know they were illegal? Because when they were asked for identification, they presented their Mexican voting card; and when asked by the sheriff's deputy whether or not they were illegal, they said, "yes."

The sheriff's deputy called the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency in Charlotte, North Carolina, to which the reply was, "We are sorry; we can't pick them up." So the sheriff's deputy let them go on their way. According to the illegal immigrants, 11 in the car, they were going to New York City to get a job.

This shows in real form the need for real border security and real border enforcement. It also shows the need for the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency to get with the times, to get rid of this bureaucracy in Washington, D.C., that is hamstringing the agents in the field, to increase their budget.

And, Madam Speaker, I call on the House of Representatives to act to make sure that we have more border enforcement agents and Customs agents in this Nation to make sure a travesty like this never happens again.

PEACHCARE IV

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today I rise for the third time this week to speak about Georgia's PeachCare crisis.

This Sunday, in just 2 days, PeachCare closes its doors to new enrollees. And if funding shortages continue, it will close its doors to all chil-

dren next month. The collapse of PeachCare will leave hundreds of thousands of hardworking Georgia families unable to provide health care for their children.

This Congress and the State of Georgia cannot let this happen. I call on the Governor of Georgia to use available State funds, and there are some that are available, to reinstate new enrollment and to sustain this imperative program until Federal funding can be increased.

PeachCare provides health care for our most precious and most vulnerable population: our children. It simply must be saved.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRESS MUST NOT INTRUDE ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVINCE OF THE PRESIDENT AS COM- MANDER IN CHIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, it has been quite a week here on Capitol Hill with the unveiling by the Democratic majority of their new plan for a fully funded withdrawal from our presence in Iraq.

The contrast that took place yesterday also was quite striking. General Petraeus, our new commander on the ground in Baghdad, had his first meeting this Thursday with the media in Baghdad, describing what our military leaders were doing in the midst of that war-torn country. And at the same time, on the other side of the world, many would-be generals here in Congress were describing their plans for the war in Iraq.

Democratic leaders, according to press releases from the House Appropriations Committee, outlined a plan for veterans' funding in the so-called war supplemental but also a plan that would set a timeline for bringing United States participation in Iraq's war to an end.

Setting very, very specific dates, the leadership, at least at this point, as we know, has outlined a proposal that establishes a timeline that would end U.S. participation in Iraq's civil war by July 1, 2007. If the President does not certify that the troops have met certain specific criteria that has been released to the media, the troops must

begin at that point an immediate redeployment of their involvement in the Iraq War which must be completed by December of 2007. Other dates, October 1, also are being discussed and other dates, including March 1, 2008. It was a startling contrast, to say the least.

On Thursday of this week, our generals in Baghdad and our "generals" here in Congress were describing their plans for the war in Iraq.

But I must say that history teaches that we have but one commander in chief, Madam Speaker. In fact, if you study the minutes of the Constitutional Convention in that balmy summer of 1787, you will find more agreement on no other point than that our Founders believed in the unified chain of command, that there would be one commander in chief and that that power, under article II of the Constitution, would be vested in the President of the United States.

We have a role in this Chamber. Under article I, Congress has the exclusive authority to declare war and to make decisions which will be a part of the aforementioned legislation to determine whether and to what degree we will fund war.

But the conduct of the war on the ground, including the setting of benchmarks, the execution of timetables on the ground and the like, fall within the purview of the commanders and specifically the commander in chief. And I would argue, as something of a student of American history, during the Revolutionary period, that our Founders rejected this because of painful experiences during the Revolutionary War. Our first commander in chief, George Washington, actually would spend every night writing letters in his tent to Congress to ask permission for military maneuvers and almost failed as a result of that micromanagement.

Congress must not intrude on the constitutional province of the President of the United States to lead us as Commander in Chief. Napoleon said it best. He said, "I would rather face 20 brilliant generals than one mediocre one."

We must, as we move into this debate, carry before the American people a very simple principle: We must support our troops in the field, provide them with the resources they need to get the job done and come home safe. But in the midst of this debate, with civility, let us also take the case to the American people of whether or not they want one commander in chief or whether they want 435 commanders in chief elected to this article I body of the Congress. I say we have one leader of our military who leads our commanders on the ground. The Constitution says it; I will stand by it.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 985, WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007; AND H.R. 1362, ACCOUNTABILITY IN CONTRACTING ACT

(Mr. ARCURI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee intends to meet the week of March 12 to grant a rule which may structure the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 985, the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2007.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol no later than 1 p.m. on Monday, March 12.

Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. A copy of that bill is posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee. Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and also should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

In addition, the Rules Committee intends to meet next week to grant a rule that may structure the amendment process on H.R. 1362, the Accountability in Contracting Act.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol no later than 1 p.m. on Tuesday, March 13.

Amendments must be drafted to the bill as ordered reported on March 8 by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. A copy of that bill will be posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee. Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that the amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1445

TRIBUTE TO DR. TED STILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise to mark the passing this week of one of the most effective environmentalists in the State of New Jersey, indeed in the country, Dr. Ted Stiles. Perhaps not the most celebrated, he should be celebrated. He preserved thousands of acres, advanced the understanding of ecology, and improved the environment for millions of people for generations to come. To some of my colleagues from the western States, thousands of acres may not sound like much, but the significance of that preservation and the difficulty of doing it in the densely populated Northeast are great.

Dr. Stiles chaired and led boards of the Stony Brook Millstone Watershed Association, the Mercer County Open Space Preservation Board, the Friends of Hopewell Valley Open Space, the Municipal Land Use Center, the New Jersey Academy of Science, and the Hutchinson Memorial Forest. He served for many years on boards, including the Crossroads of the American Revolution Association; The Nature Conservancy, New Jersey chapter; and others. He continued all of this work through his illness and up to his death.

He showed creative approaches to locally based environmental decision-making, such as his creation of the Municipal Land Use Center; and he received awards from academia and regional and community organizations and the highest environmental award from the Governor of New Jersey.

What distinguished Dr. Stiles especially was his unparalleled, unmatched ability to make people want to do those things that contribute to the general good. He made landowners want to offer their land to preservation organizations, and he made people want to spend their money to purchase and preserve that land. He made volunteer board members want to give of their time and effort to build communities and to improve the environment.

He made grad students want to go to remote places around the world to do such things as measuring the size of fruits relative to the sizes of birds' beaks so we could better understand the relationship between communities of plants and communities of animals.

He made hundreds of local citizens want to spend a day twice a year cleaning up their town. And he made a politically interested scientist want to leave a research career to run for Congress. Yes, I am that scientist. Dr. Stiles' research students continue to make contributions to research, teaching, and public policy around the country.

Throughout his life, it is not an empty cliché to say, Dr. Stiles, through goodwill and good ideas and

leadership, made this country a better place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL J. HOLLMANN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a great American. Mr. Daniel J. Hollmann of Odessa, Texas, has been a community leader in Odessa and the Permian Basin for more than three decades. A small businessman, family man and steadfast volunteer, Dan is one of the shining stars in the Eleventh Congressional District of Texas.

April 1 of this year marks the 30th anniversary of Dan receiving his license to practice law and the founding of his own firm, now Hollmann, Lyon, Patterson and Durell. Reaching this milestone is a great achievement, and I congratulate him for showing the hard work and perseverance I know it takes to run a small business.

I would also like to recognize and congratulate Dan as the 2006 recipient of the Odessa Chamber of Commerce's Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award. The award, given to the chamber member who best represents the collective goals of the business community of Odessa, was given to Dan because of his extensive volunteer history to the community and involvement in volunteerism that led to this award.

He has donated legal services to various nonprofit organizations, including the Formation of Court Appointed Special Advocates of Ector County and Catholic Charities Community Services, and is a proud supporter of many public school booster clubs, ranging from the Permian High School Choir Booster Club to the Odessa High School Basketball Booster Club.

Again, I congratulate my friend Daniel J. Hollmann on all of these achievements and thank him for his continued service to our community. Other citizens should look to him as a role model, and I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress and to call him my friend.

PROPOSED TIME LINE FOR WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. FORCES FROM IRAQ

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, on a different topic altogether, we have heard talk that the Democrats will bring forth the idea that we can set some sort of an artificial time line on when to get out of Iraq. I would argue there are really only two choices in this issue, and this third choice is false and misleading.

Here is the example: let's assume for the sake of this argument that Democrats decide in March of 2008 we need to stop this fight. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how do you look those family members in the eye whose loved ones are killed or maimed in March of 2008 and say, gee, if we had known in March of 2007 what we now know in March of 2008, that your loved one would have gotten killed, I might have thought a February 28 date was a better date.

Madam Speaker, we have no three choices. We have two choices, and they are honorable, in a sense. One is to fight this fight and win, which is the choice I believe is the correct one; or we simply raise the white flag, admit defeat, say that we have lost and get our troops out today. Anything short of that is untenable. The impact it has on the war fighter is obvious, ignoring, of course, the impact it has on the folks we oppose and the advantages it gives them. We simply cannot hamstring our fighters in this fight.

I cannot face families in July of this year or March of next year and say, gee, but for the calendar clicking off, your loved one would not have been at risk.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pick sides in this fight. Either we fight it or we get out. Pick a side. There is no third alternative.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Office of the Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, Effective immediately, I hereby resign from my position on the House Committee for Education and Labor. I have gained much from my time served on this committee, and now look forward to serving the 110th Congress in other capacities.

Best regards,

BOB INGLIS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WAXMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MANNER OF CONDUCTING PROCEEDINGS IN THE 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, we have had I think a very eventful week here this week and accomplished a significant amount and had some intense debates here on the floor of this Congress. In my time here and in anybody's memory here, I don't think anyone remembers a time that there have been three motions to recommit that have actually succeeded and attached that new policy on to the bill that was prepared for final passage here on the floor. That makes it an eventful week.

Madam Speaker, I reflect here that at the beginning of the 110th Congress there were a lot of objections to a scoreboard vote board that was kept open when Republicans were in charge for the sake of being able to allow people to change their votes until everyone was satisfied. There were strong and loud and vociferous complaints to keeping that board open when it was the Republicans in charge.

I am not here to make a loud, vociferous objection to the Democrats keeping the board open, but I am here to point out that the shoe is on the other foot today, and today this motion to recommit went up on the board, and it had 147 Democrats that voted "no" on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit, what it did was said that no individual who has been issued a transportation worker identification card may board a maritime vessel if the individual has been convicted of or found not guilty by reason of insanity in a civilian or military jurisdiction of any of the following felonies. In other words, nobody is going to be boarding a maritime vessel if they are guilty of these crimes: espionage or conspiracy, sedition or conspiracy to commit sedition, treason,

and a number of other crimes along through the list one can imagine, distribution, manufacture, purchase receipt, dealing with explosives. In other words, terrorists, people who have been identified as terrorists, convicted as terrorists. The motion to recommit said no one will be boarding a maritime vessel that has those things on their record.

Upon the first vote that was up there, the peak came out to be 247 Democrats voting against a motion that would block those who have committed those violent crimes, those crimes against this country. Then the board was left open, and as minutes went by, and I didn't watch my watch, but I am going to suspect it was 20 to 25 minutes, I watched Democrats vote their convictions and then began to adjust to their convictions, and 111 Members changed their vote here, getting down from 147 that voted "no" to 56 that voted "no," and final passage became 359 to 56 on the passage of the motion to recommit.

So I point out that sometimes that criticism that comes when you are in the minority doesn't seem like when the shoe is on the other foot that the rules you claim should apply are the ones that actually apply when you find yourself in a position of making the rules.

I would point also out that the circumstance before the Rules Committee, since that word came out of my mouth, Madam Speaker, and in the Rules Committee, we brought rules before, there were rules that were brought before this full Congress and approved for the 110th Congress. This was going to be a 110th Congress with a new majority and a new Speaker and there was going to be sunshine on everything we did. There was going to be a level of integrity in the process that was here. There were great objections to the process we had, and there was going to be a change, a new era in government, which means more openness, more honesty, more reporting.

But written into the rule was an exemption for the Rules Committee, so they are not required to report the recorded votes within the Rules Committee.

Now, how is it that here we are a more open government, but we are writing in provisions that allow for more secrecy? And that is the fact, Madam Speaker. That is the fact that came before this Congress. That is the fact that many of us voted against on the rules package. That is the amendment that I brought before the Rules Committee a couple of days ago.

What is ironic about that is that I have to go and appeal to the same people that want the secrecy and ask them if they will let me have a vote here on the floor about taking away the secrecy they have assigned themselves. Of course, the people that sat in judgment, that assigned themselves the secrecy, said, no, we won't allow a debate on it; we won't allow a vote on it. We are going to maintain the secrecy. And,

by the way, it was offensive to them to have anyone raise the issue that they should be required to report the votes of the Rules Committee when there is a recorded vote.

So that amendment was denied. The American people were denied a debate. They were denied a vote and denied an opportunity to even judge whether this is a more open process or whether it has become a more closed process.

But I think these two instances that I brought up just this week, Madam Speaker, illustrate that the process is not more open, it is not cleaner, it is not with more sunshine on it, and it is not more reflective of the representation here in this Congress. There are other instances as well as I could go on, but I think that suffices to make my point.

Madam Speaker, I came here to talk about another issue that has been rolled out in the media yesterday and today, this issue of the supplemental appropriations bill that the President has asked for in order to fund our troops in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

The President has made a request so that we can provide adequate materials, supplies, training and equipment and munitions to our military that are on the front lines who put their lives on the line for our freedom. I am pledged to uphold that support for them. But what I see come out, at least with the report of the news with regard to the supplemental, has so many strings attached. This is an unprecedented attempt on the part of Congress to micromanage a shooting war.

Our Founding Fathers understood this, and they declared in the Constitution that the President is the Commander in Chief. They didn't write in the Constitution that the President will be presiding over a committee of 435 Members of Congress on the House side and 100 Senators on the Senate side and they shall be a committee that will micromanage the nuances of a war.

The Founding Fathers knew that you could not fight a war on consensus, that you can't fight it on majority vote. You have to have a Commander in Chief who is in charge. That was a clear understanding of history and human nature. It was reflected by our Founding Fathers into our Constitution, Madam Speaker. And yet to this day, I don't know how many Members of this Congress even understand how the Constitution controls the things that they do, even though every single one of us takes an oath to this Constitution at the beginning of every Congress.

Every 2 years we stand up and we say: "I pledge to uphold the Constitution of the United States." I do so here on the floor. I make that oath on a Bible.

□ 1500

Most don't because it is hard to remember to bring the Bible with you on that day, but most do go over and have

their picture taken ceremonially with their hand on the Bible. Well, I do both if I've got the time, but the one I don't miss is I bring the Bible to the floor and I take that oath, "so help me God," to uphold this Constitution.

And if it is inconvenient to have a provision in the Constitution, we have to live with it until it becomes so inconvenient that we are willing to amend it. But we do not have the authority here in this Congress to amend the Constitution, neither does the Supreme Court and neither does the commander in chief. The people of America have to ratify an amendment to the Constitution. And that is how the Founders saw it because they understood they were not creating a democracy, Madam Speaker. And if anybody is teaching out there in the classes of civics and government that go on all over America in nearly every school in America that we are blessed to be born and live in a democracy, I have to say, Madam Speaker, that is an erroneous lesson to be teaching our young people and to be perpetuating through the adults. And, in fact, a lot of the people in this Congress still believe this is a democracy.

Well, when Benjamin Franklin stepped out of the Constitutional Congress he was asked by a lady on the streets, "What have you produced?" And his answer was, "A republic, Madam, if you can keep it." And that is what we have. We have a constitutional republic because our Founders understood that if you went to the pure democracy form, and they studied the democracies of the city-states in Greece; in fact, I have been there to see the displays at the National Archives of the pottery that the Greeks had and their method of voting demagogues out of the city and banishing them for 7 years. And some of that system is still within our Greek system on our universities today.

The Greeks identified a demagogue as someone who was so skilled with their rhetoric, so moving and passionate in their delivery of their oratorical speeches, that they could move the masses by emotion rather than rationale. So they banished the demagogues from their city-states because it sent them down the path of emotion rather than deductive reasoning.

So the Founders understood that we didn't need to have the masses moving by emotion; they understood that the definition of a democracy was two wolves and a sheep taking a vote on what's for dinner. Majority rules; guess who's for dinner?

They wrote rights into our Constitution and into the Bill of Rights because they understood human nature, and they knew there had to be protections in place higher than a majority vote, higher than being in the majority. There had to be guaranteed constitutional rights for all citizens in this country on equal standing, drafted in, plugged into the Bill of Rights and ratified by the several States, and now

ratified by all of the States, the 50 States in the Union. Those guarantees must be in place.

This Constitution, Madam Speaker, means something. And the language in this Constitution means what it says. The text of this language means what it meant, means what it was understood to be when it was ratified. And if it is inconvenient or if we disagree with the fundamentals, we should amend it. We shouldn't ignore it.

This Constitution grants Congress, this body in particular I am speaking to, but also the Senate as well, only two authorities when it comes to war; number one is, first, I will state it again, the President is the commander in chief of all Armed Services. We didn't have an Air Force then, but that is implied. So that is the standard, Madam Speaker.

And then the Constitution grants Congress two different authorities when it comes to war: Number one, the authority to declare war. That has happened several times in our history, but the last time it happened was in the beginning of World War II.

The second constitutional authority Congress has is to fund the war. But what we are seeing come out of the Democrat side of this is to micromanage the war in such a way that they can squeeze down and constrict the commander in chief's authority and responsibility to conduct war. And that can only end in disaster for our troops and disaster for the destiny of our country.

But we do not have that authority to micromanage. We can appropriate to the Department of Defense. We can appropriate to the Department of Homeland Security and some other lesser departments within the fringes. But we don't have the authority to micromanage.

I am going to go further, Madam Speaker, and take this position, that if this Congress should decide that building a bunch of ICBM missiles and placing them in places, say, across the polar ice cap are a high priority and they appropriated the money for that and we found out that we were in a shooting war that flared up maybe in six different places in the world and we needed to spend that money for armored Humvees and bullet-proof vests and more M-4 machine guns or more surveillance equipment, whatever it might be; if this Congress refused to change that appropriation, I am taking the position that the President has the authority, because he is commander in chief at a time of war, to do an interdepartmental transfer and prioritize those dollars within the Department of Defense in the place that he sees fit because he is the commander in chief. Anything less than that, Madam Speaker, is something that ties the hands of the commander in chief and the feet and puts our military at risk. That is the effort that is coming from the other side of the aisle here. And it is one that will eventually debilitate

this country. This debate has encouraged our enemies and has diminished our ability to succeed.

And so if we look back at history, I don't believe there has been any time in history that this constitutional principle that I have laid out here has been challenged and been taken to court. And even then, I wonder how the Supreme Court would come down on this. But there were times back in 1973, 1974 and 1975, at least 2 of those 3 years, if not 3 of those 3 years, when Congress put strings on Department of Defense appropriations. And those strings said this, that none of these funds and any funds heretofore having been appropriated, meaning any money that is out there in the pipeline now, none of these funds can be spent in either North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia. And it shall not be used in the skies over those four countries or offshore from those four countries. So none of our appropriations money could be used there by the restrictions that were put on by this Congress, the micromanagement of this Congress.

But the fact was that we pulled our troops out of Vietnam at that point. It wasn't the President's intent to go back into Vietnam, but it was his intent to provide air cover. So when that message went, North Vietnam probably didn't have C-SPAN then, but they watch what goes on in this Congress, just like our enemies do in Iraq and the Middle East today; they understood that Congress had lost its will to conduct war in Vietnam. And they began to marshal their forces and provide the munitions and the armament necessary to mount the invasion, which they did in the spring of 1975. And in the aftermath of Congress micromanaging a nonshooting war, 3 million people died in the South China Sea, in South Vietnam and in the countries of Laos and Cambodia, 3 million people, because Congress injected themselves into a decision that was made by the commander in chief.

But the commander in chief didn't challenge that. The commander in chief at the time, the initial one was President Nixon, who was very weak politically. And then, of course, the appointed, not elected, President Ford, whom I revere, neither challenged that restriction put on by Congress.

So I don't believe we have a constitutional challenge that has taken place because President Ford and President Nixon did not challenge the Congress when they began to tie the strings in Vietnam.

This Congress is preparing to tie the strings. And I am saying to the public, Madam Speaker, and to the President, my position is I am going to uphold this Constitution. I'm going to defend the President's right to do interdepartmental transfers of funds if they think they are going to tie strings to this. I think the President can ignore any conditions that this House puts on him if the money is appropriated at DOD because that is his responsibility as

commander in chief, not the responsibility of this Congress, not the Pelosi Congress, not the Murtha Congress, but the President of the United States is the commander in chief.

In fact, I believe the last gentleman I mentioned would like to be the commander in chief. And given some of the legislation that he has drafted and introduced in this Congress, I think he would probably squeal had he been the commander in chief and someone tried to put the strings on him that he has tried to put on the White House.

And I would add that, in the Department of Defense appropriations bill last year, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) was able to slip language into that appropriations bill that would prohibit any basing agreements from being negotiated in Iraq. He stated that it was for permanent bases, but the language said any bases. And there was misinformation that was brought to this floor. And my amendment that tried to strip that out of the appropriations bill failed here on this floor, which compelled me to go to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and ask for a letter to support my amendment, which we put to the conference committee. And that letter then was enough to get that stripped out of the language.

That is the kind of thing that is going on; that would have us already moving out of Iraq if General Pace hadn't agreed with me and made that request of the conference committee. And so the conference report came without that language, and we were able to keep our operations going in Iraq. It was that close in a Republican majority. And now you see what's coming, Madam Speaker, under this new majority.

And here are some of the bullet points that come up on this subject that would come from the majority side of the aisle. This new appropriations, the strings that would be tied, the strings that I contend are unconstitutional, one would be, the legislation prohibits the deployment of troops who are not fully mission capable. Now, who would decide that? A definition apparently that is identified by the majority here in this Congress.

There are a list of other conditions in this, but I also recognize that the gentleman from Arizona, who has a heart full of appreciation for our troops and the Constitution, is on the floor. I would be very happy to yield so much time as he may consume, Mr. SHADEGG.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate his taking the time to bring this message here to the floor and to talk about it.

I guess my curiosity or my interest is piqued by you talking about the conditions that are placed in this bill. I will tell you that I fundamentally do not believe that you can justify, that any nation could ever justify, announcing, while their troops were in the field in the middle of a war, announcing that on a date certain in the future, we are

going to unilaterally stop. It seems to me that the illogic of that should be apparent to everybody, but even perhaps the immorality of that should be important. How do we say to troops, well, fight until August of 2008, and then, by the click of a tock on the arm of a clock, by the hand going one more notch until it now becomes August 2008, the fight is over. To me, that makes no sense. And I think it is important that the Nation have a discussion about whether that policy makes any sense.

I would like to discuss it from two points of view. First of all, will withdrawing from Iraq end the war? I think that is a fair question. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, if we withdraw from Iraq, if we so called "redeploy," that will end the war. Well, I think that is worth discussing, and I think that is an important issue. But I think there is another important issue, and that issue is, what do we owe to the people of Iraq? And on that latter point, I want to note that this morning a reporter for UPI appeared on Washington Journal; her name is Pamela Hess. She has written a series of articles that, as you know, in Washington Journal, they have callers call in. And a caller called in and said, look, this is an unjustified war; we are never going to win, all the various arguments. And she said, well, I would like to suggest, and she was not taking anybody's side in the fight; she said, I would like to suggest that it is important for us to recognize that while one can criticize or analyze the reasons why we went to war, and that is one set of facts and circumstances, one can also look at why we are there now. And interestingly, her assertion is one that I have made, and she laid out an explanation. She said, having come into Iraq as we did, having dismantled their army, sent them packing, having dismantled their police forces, sent them packing, having dismantled, disassembled, taken apart their government, we created a situation where there was chaos.

□ 1515

Ms. Hess, in her comments on Washington Journal this morning, said, stop for a moment and imagine if another country had invaded the United States and if they had wiped out our Army and wiped out and disbanded our police forces and sent them home and then taken down our government. How long would it take before even here in the United States we began to see chaos, not unlike the chaos you see on the streets in Iraq?

And her argument was one that I think is the other important argument which is not being made in this debate. The one, as I mentioned, is if we retreat, if we embrace defeat, as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are urging us to do, and say we cannot win in Iraq, let us leave and let us leave by a date certain, my first argument is, we can leave but the war will not end. I would suggest they have al-

ready demonstrated they will come to the United States. They will attack us here. They will attack Americans and nonradical Muslims all over the world. They will attack us and other Westerners in Europe, in Spain, in Indonesia. They will attack us everywhere. So I will suggest the war will not end.

The second argument is, forgetting how the war started, what obligation do we have to assist the people of Iraq in reestablishing the basics of a government, of a police force and of an army such that they can stop chaos, they can stop lawlessness?

One of the ways that you hear people in the Middle East articulate this, and the ambassadors from Jordan and Saudi Arabia came and made this argument to us and I think you heard them talk, they said the United States came into Iraq uninvited; the United States owes it to the Middle East and to the people of Iraq not to leave uninvited. And then you ask them what they mean by that, and they mean the same thing that Pamela Hess said, which is we have an obligation to aid the Iraqi people at least until they can get a government up and functioning, an army up and functioning, and a police force so that chaos does not reign.

I think those are the two key arguments. I would insert into the RECORD articles that Ms. Hess has written since returning from her most recent visit to Iraq that document the things that have changed.

ANALYSIS: LOUDSPEAKER DIPLOMACY
(By Pamela Hess)

RAMADI, IRAQ, FEB. 17.—It's old fashioned. It's low-tech but it works. One U.S. unit operating in Iraq has found the best way to win hearts and minds is to put loudspeakers on police stations. The speaker systems are erected over the police stations. The daily broadcasts are 10 to 15 minutes long. They are timed not to compete with the call to prayers, and the messages are written by the police and local political officials. Some of the speeches are copied onto CDs and distributed around town. The broadcasts include Iraqi top 40 music; news dispatches taken from the BBC and Al Jazeera, speeches by the governor and the police chief, warnings about high threat areas, and the national anthem.

"That's a pretty catchy song," said Maj. Dan Zappa, the executive officer of the 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, responsible for security operations in some of the most contested areas of Ramadi. "It's interspersed with popular music. We've got video of kids dancing, hundreds of them, jumping around."

"We have the police chief in western Ramadi," Zappa said, "and he's addressing his family, his extended family and his tribe." Said Maj. Tiley Nunnink, a guest staff member of the battalion sent by the Marine Corps Warfighting Lab in Virginia: "It's a vehicle for Iraqi policemen to say what they need to say to the people."

The loudspeaker program would be a gamble in a town without a legitimate local police presence. In that case it would just be the overbearing—and clumsily worded—symbol of the occupation trying to co-opt local religious customs, senior commanders said.

But they believe the loudspeaker broadcasts are part of what seems to be turning the population in Ramadi against the insurgency.

"The system's working because the local population is approaching the Iraqi police with valuable information to help put down criminal acts—roadside bombs, building IEDs, stuff like that," Zappa said.

"Those are definitely the metrics, how does the population respond to this?" Nunnink said. "You can hear it in the broadcast. The broadcast says thank you for providing this information. You're contributing to the further security of the city."

The loudspeaker initiative addresses a huge hole in U.S. warfighting capabilities in Iraq: Insurgents can turn around videos of successful attacks on U.S. convoys, or dead Iraqi soldiers, or doctored or misrepresented footage of events within hours, sometimes before those events have even been reported to American headquarters. The videos show up on racks of bootlegged DVDs and CDs that seem to be for sale on nearly every street corner almost instantaneously.

Deployed U.S. forces however, do not have the authority to respond directly on their own; "information operations" products and messages have to be approved at high levels in the chain of command. That takes time, and by the time the message is approved, the story has moved on. Score one for the adversary.

"I have the power to call in a lethal air strike but not to respond to an insurgent video," one senior U.S. commander told UPI this week.

"We've been getting our butt kicked by the (local) media," Zappa said. "There would be an incident when they would blow up a Humvee and kill two Marines and wound civilians, and they would turn that around and say that we wounded the civilians."

"That's how information travels out here, by word of mouth," Nunnink said. "So the question was, how are we going to compete with that?"

Ramadi is notorious as one of the bloodiest battlefields for U.S. forces.

"There are local Iraqis doing great things for the community, innocent civilians, heroes, trying to put down the insurgents," said Zappa, a native of Pittsburgh. "They are out there but they don't have the ability to get the voice that the insurgents do. So that population sitting on the fence doesn't know, doesn't understand because they are not in receive mode of that information."

For the last four years, U.S. forces have tried hosting daily radio shows or cobbling together television broadcasts to try to win the loyalty of the people. They hand out flyers promising additional reconstruction funds if violence ebbs. None of the delivery methods are really ideal for this culture; the flyers go unread, the television and radio require a recalcitrant public to actively tune in to listen. But one thing everyone listens to is the booming call to prayers from the local mosque's loudspeakers, five times a day, plus a sermon on Friday.

Zappa and Nunnink and several other headquarters officers meet weekly to discuss the "non-kinetic" campaign—that is, all the non-lethal activities the battalion conducts.

"Our approach was what can we do that is gonna be more effective. We can kill bad guys all day but you're never gonna kill enough of them; They are always gonna create more. So we ask, what do the people really need? What's gonna give a tactical advantage? What's gonna get the Iraqi army, get the police out there? These are the things that drove us," Zappa said.

"We realized the opportunity was here if we could convince people the insurgency is not supporting them, it was destroying their city . . . it was just offering chaos, and capitalize on that, and the little successes that

these (Iraqi police) guys were bringing to the table."

It was in one of these meetings they came up with the notion of a loudspeaker campaign of their own.

ANALYSIS: THE U.S. WAR OF IDEAS
(By Pamela Hess)

WASHINGTON, JAN. 5.—As the "global war on terrorism" enters its sixth year, the United States government is beginning to rethink its approach to the larger battle—the so-called "war of ideas."

The war on terror is, at its heart, a physical fight against extremists. The war of ideas, on the other hand, is a philosophical debate that pits extremist ideology in the Muslim world against tolerance and freedom. So far, however, the United States seems to be losing.

A Zogby International poll released in December shows that the vast majority of Arabs in five key countries view the United States and its policies in a strongly negative light. In two countries, Jordan and Morocco, attitudes have declined precipitously in the last year.

U.S. government officials are grappling with how to win the war of ideas, and some are embracing fresh conclusions: that U.S. actions speak louder than any propaganda it can put forth; that the promotion of democracy should be a sidecar to providing humanitarian aid and economic development in the Arab world; and acceptance that the United States has only a peripheral role to play in the core philosophical debate central to the war of ideas.

"I think we have to think about influencing people. The way we influence people is not just what we say, but by what we do and who we are," a Pentagon official closely involved in the Defense Department's piece of the war of ideas, told UPI last month. "It is not primarily about messaging." For 40 years during the Cold War, the U.S. waged a war of ideas against communism and totalitarianism, and won.

"During the Cold War, that was arguably easier to do because the Soviet Union was oppressing people. It was an easier argument to make, and (in Eastern Europe) we were more or less culturally on neutral ground," he said.

"... They didn't really know about us because they were in relatively closed societies. They didn't necessarily hate us," he said.

This new battle is more difficult and requires a different approach, the official said. "We are starting in the hole," he acknowledged. "In the Muslim world when 70 percent of the people are opposed to the United States, that's a much harder sell."

It does not help that many people in the Middle East identify their own governments as their oppressors, and the United States as their oppressors' allies.

"We start going in, we go in knowing they dislike us," he said. "It's gonna take a long time." He conceives the battle as having two major fronts, and in only one of them can the United States play a major public role.

The official said the U.S. should not be trying to counter terrorist propaganda. It should be finding ways to encourage competing visions within the Islamic world.

"In the strategic sense I don't think we need to have a counter-narrative," the official said. "The violent extremists, they have a single narrative. And I think from a purely strategic perspective we just have to make sure there are other narratives—not necessarily our own—that compete with theirs." The debate must be engaged by "protagonists within the Muslim community," he said—probably theologians from Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim country.

"We know that the (Muslim) community is much more diverse than it (seems). We have to find those people. I actually think we would do ourselves a great favor if we worked from the outside in, but look to examples outside of the Arab core."

There are "individuals who don't necessarily agree with the United States but who don't agree with violence as a tool," he said. "Supporting that is very important. How we do that is the tough part, because we don't want to taint them by virtue of overt association (with the United States). The government is struggling with how to do that."

The second front in the war of ideas is one in which the United States can play a direct public role: changing the conditions in the Arab world that feed terrorism—the lack of educational and economic opportunity, poor health care, and repressive regimes.

"Look at the level of despair in the Arab world. It rivals sub-Saharan Africa," he said. "That, plus broken regimes in that part of the world—it's a tinder box."

The official believes desperate conditions do not cause Islamic extremism. But they are what makes the Middle East so ripe for recruitment.

"They are the kindling of terrorism. They are what terrorists exploit," he said. "I think what the United States can do is essentially remove the kindling."

Done well, that could have two effects—draining the number of potential terrorist recruits and sympathizers, and demonstrating American good will in the Muslim world with actions rather than words.

"Think about Hezbollah or al Qaeda affiliates or ... (Muqtada Sadr in Iraq). What do they do? They don't stand on street corners only getting out proselytizing. They set up clinics, they give out food. That's their way of getting in," he said.

"If you look at the (U.S. response to the) tsunami, to the earthquake in Pakistan, the earthquake in Iran—that's when we got the biggest spike," he said. "Some of the things that have given us the greatest return are not the things we intended."

The Bush administration's emphasis on democracy building in the region is necessary, he said, but likely to fail if the "kindling" is not addressed.

"I do think you have to address the regimes. But I would say that the second-tier efforts, removing kindling (is more important). It's not just about notions, however justified, of democracy alone. It's more broadly about (developing a) healthy society, a civil society and addressing grievances." Moreover, what the United States considers a democracy may have to change if democracy is to be embraced in the Muslim world.

"We often ask the question... is Islam compatible with democracy? But we never question the other side, taking the religion as a given and seeing how flexible democracy is," he said. "We pay lip service to the fact that (Arab democracies are) not going to look like us. But I think we very rarely say we ought to revisit what a democracy is, and what role religion can play in it," he said. "If we do that we might be more flexible, and there might be different approaches that might be successful."

He is disturbed that pundits characterize the war on terrorism as a clash of civilizations. "That feeds our adversaries," he said. "The reality is I don't see this as a (rift) between Islam or between the East and West. It's a horizontal (split) within civilizations," he said.

ANALYSIS: IRAQ OUT OF TIME, NEEDS TROOPS
(By Pamela Hess)

WASHINGTON, DEC. 15.—A leading U.S. military analyst is advocating the addition of

some 30,000 U.S. forces to Iraq, with a new mission: to protect the Iraqi people.

Frederick Kagan, a former instructor at West Point and now a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, believes his plan to add seven Army brigade combat teams and Marine regiments to Baghdad and Anbar province early next year could establish security in Baghdad by the fall of 2007. While much of the focus in Washington is on increasing the pace of American training of Iraqi security forces who will eventually take on the bulk of the fighting, Kagan argues the United States and Iraq no longer has that luxury of time.

"Iraq has reached a critical point. The strategy of relying on a political process to eliminate the insurgency has failed. Rising sectarian violence threatens to break America's will to fight. This violence will destroy the Iraqi government, armed forces, and people if it is not rapidly controlled," he writes. "Violence is accelerating beyond the Iraqis' ability to control it."

The surge in troops, if it succeeds in turning around the deteriorating situation in Iraq, would pave the way for a major troop withdrawal in 18 to 24 months, he says.

But the surge would also mean an increase in battle casualties, now nearing 3,000.

"Short-term increase in casualties is not a sign of failure ... As troops actively secure the population the enemy will surge its attacks on coalition troops and Iraqi civilians," Kagan writes.

He envisions a four-phase strategy in 2007: surging forces into Iraq by March; preparing for "clear and hold" operations by June; clear critical areas by September; and then transition control of them to Iraqi forces.

"These forces, partnered with Iraqi units, will clear critical Sunni and mixed Sunni-Shiite neighborhoods, primarily on the west side of the city. After the neighborhoods have been cleared, U.S. soldiers and Marines, again partnered with Iraqis, will remain behind to maintain security," Kagan writes in a new paper for AEI.

The clear and hold operation would be closely linked to a U.S. military led-reconstruction package with a fully funded plan in place prior to the battles so they can immediately pick up trash and get water and electricity working, area by area.

"Even large reconstruction efforts are cheap compared to continued fighting," he notes. It's an expansion of the tactics used with some success in Tall 'Afar and Fallujah but far more ambitious. Those towns were a fraction of the size of Baghdad and relatively isolated, making them easier to surround, empty and conduct house-to-house searches. Their size and location also allowed the return of residents, and potential fighters, to be managed.

Five U.S. brigades are currently operating in Baghdad along with six Iraqi brigades. In Anbar province, there are two Marine regimental combat teams and one U.S. Army brigade combat team. Together, they comprise just 52,500 combat forces in a total U.S. deployment of about 140,000. The remainder are serving in combat service support, headquarters, intelligence and other non-battle functions. Kagan's plan would bring the number of combat troops to 84,000 by September 2007, nearly a 50 percent increase in combat power.

Kagan is not alone in advocating a troop increase. Senior military officers who spoke to UPI on condition of anonymity say that having sufficient troops in Iraq to actually quell the insurgency and combat sectarian violence is the one approach the United States has not yet tried. Since the insurgency began in earnest in November 2003, U.S. forces have been playing catch-up, never having quite enough troops to both carry out

aggressive offensive operations and to maintain a daily presence in the areas already under control. That has resulted in a nationwide "whack-a-mole" strategy, they said.

When they have come down hard on one area, the enemy has squeezed out to somewhere they are not. The training of more than 300,000 Iraqi army and police has provided a "holding" force but their performance has been uneven at best, and in the case of the police, sometimes counterproductive. And the intervening three years has similarly allowed the insurgent and militia forces to grow as well, diminishing the impact Iraqi forces can have.

The answer, according to Kagan, is a dramatic increase in the number of U.S. troops assigned to protecting Iraq's civilian population.

To get the number of U.S. troops up, Kagan proposes to accelerate the deployment of the next four brigades, now scheduled from April to February. The remaining BCTs would be extended from a 12-month deployment to 15 months. The Marine regiments would be extended from seven months to 12. That would bring the American troops presence in Baghdad up to nine or 10 BCTs, each with about 4,000 soldiers. The plan would also result in two additional Marine regimental combat teams in Anbar province.

Kagan would not pull forces from outside of Baghdad into that fight. Rather, he would leave them in place to continue their daily operations—preventing insurgents and sectarian militias from establishing a foothold in areas previously secured from them.

This military version of "robbing Peter to pay Paul" has been played out repeatedly throughout the war, commanders have complained. When they have stabilized an area, troops get called on to put out a fire somewhere else—leaving a security vacuum where they came from and inviting new violence.

If the clear and hold plan is carried out in Baghdad in 2007, Kagan writes that in 2008 the U.S. military could help disarm Shiite militias, stabilize Anbar or northern Iraq, and/or continue the training mission. Kagan concedes the potential responses to an invigorated American offensive in Iraq, outlining each factions' likely responses, and the most dangerous short- and long-term scenarios, along with a plan to counter them.

Kagan also says the U.S. Army and Marine Corps must add at least 60,000 troops to their pay roll in the next two years and the increase must be permanent.

It is "vital to offset increased demand on the ground forces in Iraq, and vital to provide strategic options in many scenarios beyond Iraq," he writes.

Army Chief of Staff Gen. Peter Schoomaker said Thursday that the most the Army can hope to recruit above the 80,000 a year it does now is 6,000 to 7,000 additional soldiers. Marine Corps officials believe they can add another 2,000 additional recruits annually. However, the Army and Marine Corps could likely retain far greater numbers of troops than they currently do. Re-enlistments and extensions are at all time highs, particularly among combat units deployed to Iraq.

Schoomaker also warned that if he does not get additional troops, and more freedom to use reservists to fill out the force, the Army is in danger of "breaking."

Kagan says his plan will not break the Army: only four units would be accelerated to Iraq, and they were tapped to go anyway. Moreover, no unit will have less than a year between deployments under his plan.

"Losing now will certainly break the force," Kagan writes.

Kagan could not be immediately reached for comment. An AEI spokeswoman said he was at a White House briefing.

As I mentioned, she has written a series of these articles. She went to Iraq, as she explained this morning on Washington Journal, to look at the question of how is it that our troops in Iraq feel they have such an important mission, feel they are accomplishing things. She mentioned that this was her third, I believe, visit to Iraq, and she said, this time, more than either of the two visits, she felt like our troops were more engaged, working more closely with the Iraqi people, felt a greater kinship with the Iraqi people, and felt like they were making progress.

Her purpose was to say, well, this must be just a myth. It must not be true that our troops are really feeling like they are accomplishing something; they are just parroting words given to them from the commanders and higher up.

But her pitch this morning was that is not true; that in point of fact, the thing that has changed was in part the attitude of our troops and the enhanced ability of our troops who have now been deployed there two or three times to speak Arabic, but also that the attitude of the Iraqi people has changed. She talked about how the Iraqi people are now rising up, resisting the violence, fighting back on their own and engaged in this battle in a way in which she had not seen before.

I believe this supplemental is extremely important to our Nation. I believe our confrontation with radical, militant Islam is the single most important confrontation we will face probably in my lifetime. I think back about the threat to world peace posed by communism, which is the threat I grew up with as a child, and I have to evaluate that threat versus the threat we now face with radical, militant Islam.

I have begun to read some of the writings on radical, militant Islam and what they want. I would commend to anyone who cares about this issue a book by a Yale professor by the name of Mary Habeck. Professor Habeck came and spoke, I think you know, to the bipartisan caucus on anti-terrorism and I heard her. I was very impressed. She has written a book called, "Knowing the Enemy," and that book goes into detail on how the radical Islamic wing, the jihadi wing of the Islam faith, strays from the Koran, and how at times they have twisted the Koran, at least in her opinion, and have come to this conclusion that they must reestablish the caliphate, they must stay at a constant state of war, they want to not only reestablish the caliphate in its historical areas, but then expand it and at least require that every nation in the world be under the domination of radical Islam; and that everybody there has to at least be offered the opportunity to live under radical Islam. Then the question of whether or not they have to kill you if you do not remains on the table, but it is an excellent book, and I would urge that people read it. The other book that I would

say people should read is a book called, "America Alone," by Mark Steyn.

Again, I think the challenge we face from radical Islam and its confrontation of Western society, ours here in America, Japan, Germany, France, Italy, Britain, is the single most important confrontation, single most important challenge of our lifetimes for us, for our children, for our grandchildren.

I understand the frustration of my colleagues who want us to get out and get out as quickly as we can. It breaks my heart. I have been there three times. I have seen grave errors made in the conduct of the war. I am troubled by the conduct of the war. I am embarrassed by our conduct of the war at times, but that does not answer the fundamental question. The fundamental question is: Can we leave? If we leave, does the war stop? If we leave, does it instead get worse?

I would suggest that if we leave Iraq, if we decide we cannot win there now, if we follow what the current draft supplemental proffered this week by the other side says and say in August of 2008, we are out no matter what, I think things do not get better. I would suggest that what happens is that the radical jihadi now in Iraq seeking to kill us there simply pick up their stakes, jump in a pick-up truck and head to Afghanistan, and suddenly we are fighting the same fight in Afghanistan.

I heard my colleagues on the floor and in the statement say we should be fighting in Afghanistan, and that is a serious fight, and the Taliban and the insurgency are re-arising in their battle and their challenge to us. I agree with them about that. But the problem is, what have we gained if we just moved the fight from Iraq to Afghanistan? And are we willing to stand up to the radical jihadi somewhere? Because if we do not do it in Iraq, I would submit we are going to have to do it somewhere.

I would also suggest that before we abandon Iraq, we need to think about what it is we owe to the people of that society. Having torn down their institutions, having torn down their government, their police and their army, what do we owe them to help them rebuild those institutions before we walk away?

And so I think the supplemental is very important. I think it is going to get a lot of discussion and debate. I personally believe that as long as you leave an arbitrary cut-off date in it that says we will be out of there as of a date certain, it is something I personally cannot support; and I would hope the American people would look at what jeopardy that places us in.

I think you also hear General Petraeus say, look, I just started this job. I need the troops to be able to accomplish it. There are early signs we are making progress. Give me a chance.

I think that is a plea that I hope we do not abandon. I hope that it is a plea

we acknowledge. I would agree that we cannot leave it totally open-ended.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me some time on this point. I thought it was worth my time to cite this reporter, Pamela Hess, and talk about her because she has just been there. She went with the purpose of trying to find out are things different, and at least as I heard her comments on Washington Journal this morning, she said things are different, progress is being made, and the Iraqi people are kicking in. She cited vastly better than I can examples of that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), and I pick up a point that Mr. SHADEGG made, and that is about what the enemy thinks and what happens if we should pull out of the central battlefield in this war on terror called Iraq.

So I am going to just make this transitional point here, Madam Speaker, and that is, I have a date written down here. July 11, 2004, I was sitting in a hotel in Kuwait City waiting to go into Iraq the next day, and I turned on al Jazeera TV, and I saw the face of this rather notorious person right here, Moqtada al Sadr, and he was speaking in Arabic with the English crawler going on underneath, and as I read what he said, and I heard it sparingly in Arabic, he said, if we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu. Moqtada al Sadr who has now absconded to Iran to be with his cronies who have been funding him, supporting him, sending him munitions and training him.

But the philosophy that he has voiced here is a philosophy that echoes back in the ghosts of Vietnam and through Lebanon and Mogadishu, and that is, do our enemies take great heart in believing that we do not have the will to complete a military task if it gets difficult or if it gets long?

So the voice of Moqtada al Sadr saying Americans will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, Lebanon and Mogadishu will be replaced should we not succeed in Iraq, and I will point out that Prime Minister Maliki stood right back here at this microphone some months ago, and he said, if this war against terrorism cannot be won in Iraq, it cannot be won anywhere.

Our enemy will know that. We must succeed there on that battleground. The al Qaeda is in Iraq. They have come there to fight us. They have generated a few more out of the Sunnis there in particular; but if we pulled out of Iraq the way the other side would like to see that happen, then the battlefield does transfer to Afghanistan, and that battlefield in Afghanistan will be inspired by a failure to achieve victory in Iraq.

I would point out that the next poster you will see on this floor after such a time, if this Congress acts in a disgraceful fashion, then the next poster you will see will not be the face of

Moqtada al Sadr, Mr. Speaker, but it will be the face of Osama bin Laden himself and the quote will not be quite like this. It will be close, though. It will read like this: If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Afghanistan the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu and the same way they left Iraq.

That is what is coming if this side of the aisle does not suck it up and understand that far more American lives are at risk if we do not have the will and the resolve to succeed. Playing politics with the lives of American soldiers and playing politics with the destiny of America just simply cannot be tolerated.

This supplemental appropriations bill, as it is announced to be written, and we do not have a draft to work with yet, is, I believe, an unconstitutional micromanaging of the powers of the Commander in Chief of the United States.

I wish to support and reiterate the statements made by the gentleman from Arizona when he said with the tick of a clock, the fight is over. Can you imagine, Madam Speaker, that a war would be like a prize fight and you would go for 10 rounds, or if it is a championship battle, maybe 15 rounds, could be 12, and when the round is over, the bell rings and the fight stops, and we come home on a date certain, at a time certain, without succeeding in a victory? That is an amazing and astonishing thing, and anyone who is involved in a guerrilla warfare of an insurgency against the United States will know all they have got to do is go underground, hole up and wait; when American soldiers are finally gone, whether lifted off of the U.S. embassy or whether they happen to be deployed out of their troop ships or flown out in jet airliners, they would know that then the enemy would have that battlefield to themselves.

The point made also by Mr. SHADEGG, we came in uninvited, we cannot leave uninvited. That is a profound statement that should be in the conscience of all of us, and we have made progress. We have made significant progress.

The attitude of the Iraqi people I thought was good 3 years ago or even 4 years ago, and I do understand that their attitude is betting better and better, but they are also nervous that we are not going to stick it out.

But if we should leave, there is no doubt things will get worse; and the worse that I would describe, Madam Speaker, is I do not think this is necessarily the worst-case scenario, but I will describe this as a likely-case scenario, and that is, right now Iran is fighting a proxy war against the United States. They are doing so in Iraq. They have been funding and supporting two large Shia militia. One of them would be Sadr's militia and the other one is the Badr Brigade. They have been supporting anyone who will increase the chaos and the disorder in

Iraq. They have not only been funding them and supporting them and they have been putting munitions into Iraq that are used against American service personnel and against Iraqi military security personnel. That has gone on for at least 2 years that I know of and it has gone on intensively and finally came out in the press a little over a month ago.

□ 1530

Iran is fighting a proxy war against the United States, and those who attack the United States and provide munitions and funding and training have a sovereign sanctuary to retreat to and hide in, and that is Iran.

I know of no example in history where you have had an insurgency that was funded by a sovereign sanctuary nation that has been protected from the assault of the troops that have been attacked out of that nation, and that prevailing side has always been the side that had the sanctuary, not the side that gave sanctuary.

I am opposed to giving sanctuary in Iran to them so they can fight their proxy war against the United States. If we have enemies, they cannot be hiding behind national boundaries. We must regard them as enemies wherever they are. But if we do not prevail in Iraq, and the pervasive influence that has taken place there by the Shi'a from Iran is imposed in the southern part of Iraq and also in Baghdad as well, which it surely could be controlled by the Shi'as, that would allow Iran in the aftermath with their hegemony to control 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil.

If Ahmadinejad has control of 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil, and about two-thirds of the real estate in Iraq and ultimately maybe more than that, his coffers get flushed full of cash. As the cash flows out of his treasure chest, he starts putting more and more money into his war chest, and that war chest becomes more and more nuclear capable, accelerating their development of nuclear weapons, weapons, in the plural, multiple plural, and means to deliver them, which means more and more missiles to put nuclear warheads on them, not just to threaten Israel, which Ahmadinejad has sworn to annihilate.

He has also sworn to defeat and annihilate the United States. Those missiles would not be constrained to just having the range to drop into Tel Aviv, but they would have soon the range to get into Western Europe and, not much later than that, the range to reach the United States.

This is a nation that has a suicidal tendency and a belief that they are called upon by Allah to annihilate the infidels. Infidels happen to be anyone who doesn't agree with them on their religion.

So think, Madam Speaker, in terms of a Middle East that is controlled by Ahmadinejad and the mullahs in Iran. They set on the Strait of Hormuz. If they have that valve, they will have

the valve at the Strait of Hormuz to control what goes in and what goes out, which amounts to 42.6 percent of the world's exportable oil supply. That is easily enough to make them filthy rich and easily enough to affect the world's economy if they crank that valve down and shut down just a valve, it is a figurative valve, shutting down the oil exports going out of the Strait of Hormuz. They would control all of the Middle East if this happens. Then this Nation would go into a recession, probably a depression.

If that happens, that reflects back to China, because China also is out there on the world market doing all that they can for the oil that they need, and they are dependent on the U.S. economy. The United States and China would be the big losers. Russia and Iran would be the big winners. Iran for obvious reasons; Russia because they have a lot of oil.

That explains why Putin has taken a hostile position against the United States. He wants things to go that direction in Iraq. He wants us out of there. He wants the Iranians to take over in Iraq because that helps his world dominance and that helps his power base. That is an equation that I don't believe is considered by the retreatniks that are writing these line items of micromanagement into this supplemental appropriations bill, this, I believe, it will come out to be an unconstitutional supplemental appropriations bill.

I would be happy to recognize the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman. You hit upon one of the keys or at least one of the major concerns or arguments that I have over the idea of our colleagues that we can withdraw from Iraq and it will end the war.

You touched upon the fact that radical Islam teaches that they must kill all infidels. I make the point that, look, I understand the desire of people who want us out of Iraq to end the war and end the killing and to not have American troops on the battleground dying each day. I want that as well.

The question one has to ask is, is that a viable strategy? A lot of people think back to the Vietnam War and say, well, look, we ultimately made a decision that we couldn't win the Vietnam War. Indeed, as your discussion earlier in this hour pointed out, there were Members of this Congress who decided we want out of Vietnam; we are going to cut the funding back; that will bring us home.

Some could argue that with the help of this Congress, we did cut off funding for the Vietnam War, and the Vietnam War did end. I would suggest for thoughtful Americans looking at this today, we are in a very different world. To my knowledge, and I have asked this of a number of people, I know of no incident ever where any North Vietnamese leader had announced that, if we finished in Vietnam and left Vietnam, that would be insufficient. I know

of no Vietnamese, North Vietnamese, leader, Communist Vietnam leader, even leader of Communist China at the time, who said, as soon as we defeat the Americans in Vietnam, then we will take the fight to them in the United States.

That is a very, very, very, very different circumstance than we have here. Read Osama bin Laden. Read Ayman al Zawahiri. Read any of the leaders of the radical militant Islamic movement in the world of the leaders of al Qaeda, now thought to be reforming in the mountain areas of Pakistan and reasserting itself in a more cohesive fashion; they have made it clear. They don't want us just out of Iraq. Their goal isn't, if the Americans will leave Iraq, the war will end. They have never said that. What they have said over and over and over again is, we intend to kill the great Satan.

You talked about Ahmadinejad. He has given speeches in which he envisioned a world in which there is no Israel and a world in which there is no United States. How does one unilaterally declare peace? I think that is a fair question; could we have said at some point during World War II, you know what, we are losing soldiers in France, we are losing soldiers in the Netherlands fighting this battle, let's just quit, and the war will end? Or had Hitler said, I am going on, I am going forward, my plan is an Aryan domination of the world?

This is a different circumstance. The leaders of this radical, militant, jihadist movement have said, we must confront the infidel. As you just explained, they define it: Anybody who doesn't believe and practice Islam the way they believe it and practice it must be killed.

I think by announcing, as this proposed supplemental bill does, and the language of it clearly states, we will leave Iraq by August 2008 no matter what. We have to think about the message that sends. That is a very clear message. That message is, if you are Osama bin Laden hiding somewhere in Pakistan or on the border lands between Pakistan and Afghanistan, and you hear that message, and you know he is paying attention, and he has heard that message, what do you think? If you are Ayman al Zawahiri and you are his chief lieutenant and you hear that message, it is very clear: Hang tight, lay low, go to the cities outside of Baghdad, keep your profile low, kill a few people on the side as you are going, but don't worry about it, because, in a handful of months, maybe as early as next January, but, according to this measure that the Democrats announced earlier this week, no later than August 2008, the Americans will withdraw from Iraq, gone, finished, out of here.

You have just announced to Osama bin Laden: Hang on, hold tight. In August, the Americans will abandon Iraq. In August, the war will end, and you will have control of Iraq, assuming the

Iraqis can't defend themselves at that point, and you can take this war forward wherever you want to take it forward.

I don't understand the mindset of that. I understand the mindset of somebody who says, end the war tomorrow, let's bring them home. That is safe. If that's the choice of the American public, if that's the choice of the majority in this United States Congress, that is something, get them home and get them home tonight because they are safe.

But announcing that they will leave as of almost a year and a half from now, and between then they fight for what, is something I just can't understand. I do believe that Osama bin Laden and Al Zawahiri will understand that message.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I reflect upon the last time we fought this enemy, and the first time that I know that we fought this enemy goes clear back into the early part of the 1500s, and I pick it up in a book called, "Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters," when the Corsairs, Barbary pirates, would set upon the merchant marines that were sailing around the Mediterranean; they also raided the coastlines from Greece all the way up along the coast, Italy, France, Spain, up to England and as far north as Iceland.

Iceland itself was the furthest, most northerly venture on the part of the Barbary pirates, who pressed 400 Icelanders into slavery, took them back to the Barbary Coast on the north shore of Africa and put them into slavery, where they died faster than any of the other slaves. But all together the history totals up about 1.25 million Christian slaves pressed into slavery by the Barbary pirates. This was just in the 1500s.

Now, the first shooting war we got into in the United States began right after the end of the violence in the Revolutionary War. We finished, the battle was over, and 1783, here in this country, we had the protection of the French flag for our merchant marine at that time on the high seas; 1784, we lost the protection of the French flag when we had won our independence. Between that period of time and our Constitution being ratified in 1789, the protection of the French flag left us.

So, from 1783 was when hostilities ended with Great Britain; 1784, the Barbary pirates fell upon our merchant marine ships, pressed our soldiers into slavery, and we had to build a Marine Corps and a Navy to go on and take on the Barbary pirates who were negotiated with in 1786 by Thomas Jefferson and by Ben Franklin and by John Adams. Jefferson brought a report back to this Congress, and that report is clearly a document within the history of this Congress.

It can be found in a report that is delivered over here in the Library of Congress, where he said that he had tried to negotiate with the Muslim leader at

the time, and he asked: Why do you attack us? Why do you kill us? We have no quarrel with you. We have had a peaceful posture with regard to you, and yet your whole regime sets upon us in the high seas.

The answer he got back was, Allah commands that we do this. He commands that we attack and kill you, or press you into slavery until you either pay homage or adopt and convert to our religion.

That report comes back from Thomas Jefferson. Those are the same circumstances that we are in today, just a few, couple 300-plus years down the line. Jefferson's analysis was, how do you negotiate with people who have a religious belief that they need to kill you in order to be saved? In fact, in Jefferson's report, the world of Islam over there, the Barbary pirates at the time said that anyone who was killed attacking the infidels would surely go to paradise.

He understood them. That is why he bought a Koran, was to do his oppositional research. That is what we are up against today, the same thing. If we don't understand our enemy, if we don't understand nosce hostem, which is a Latin term for, "know my enemy," came out of Romans, then we have the kind of appropriations bill that would have all these strings tied in such a way as the President can only deploy unprepared troops, and then it sets up some standards for that. If we need to defend ourselves, we couldn't do so unless we met this standard that is created by the other side of the aisle.

Mr. KING of Iowa. This bill presumably also requires the Iraqi government to meet the key security, political and economic benchmarks established by the President in his State of the Union address. That was January 10.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is interesting, since you were talking about history and since you have been using this quote, and I knew this before the gentleman got here, but the last time, to my recollection, that the United States Congress has cut off funds for troops in the field and demanded they be taken out of someplace was in November of 1993. It was a motion written by a gentleman from New York, a Republican by the name of Ben Gilman. It was brought to this floor by a Republican by the name of Jerry Solomon, and it instructed the Clinton administration to get troops out of Somalia.

I just think that is important to add, in a historical context, that this has happened before. In fact, Members through the Republican party have led the effort to get the troops out of a Muslim-dominated country within the last couple of decades.

I do want to remind the American people that you were not here for that. I was. I had to do a little research to

remember the exact set of circumstances, but I do think it is important to add to this debate.

□ 1545

Mr. KING of Iowa. I also recognize you are a fair-minded Mississippian, and I appreciate that and the tone and the history that you have added. And perhaps on your walk across here, you might not have heard my remarks with regard to the Vietnam era and the constraints that were put on the appropriations bill then. And so I don't think that we are in disagreement on the precedence or the history. We may or may not be in disagreement on the constitutional aspects.

And what I have done is taken a position that Congress does not have the authority to micromanage. And I was not here to put up a vote on that, but you can expect, Madam Speaker, how I would have voted had that been the case.

But these micromanaging efforts, and this is a newspaper publishing information, would appear to require that the Iraqi government meet key security, political, and economic benchmarks that were established by the President in the State of the Union Address on January 10. Now, those were goals at that time. I don't speak for the commander in chief on that, but I know now that we are well passed January 10. On January 10, there wasn't a plan that had been unfolded like the plan we are working on today. And you have to be flexible in a time of war. And to go back and pull things out of his speech and say, and we are going to tie you to that on appropriations, I think that does two things: I don't think that is prudent, and I don't think it is constitutional.

Another one would be the Iraqi failure to meet these benchmarks would mean the beginning of U.S. withdrawal from Iraq and will restrict economic aid to the Iraqis. Another case, Madam Speaker, of setting up a standard here in Congress, and the slow wheels of this Congress can creep along. And then we put something in place that would prohibit us, prohibit the commander in chief from being flexible in time of war.

It goes on. Another standard would be, if progress toward meeting any key benchmark is not met by July 1, 2007; we will hardly get any legislation passed before then; a redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq begins immediately and must be completed within 180 days.

Madam Speaker, progress towards meeting benchmarks, that is a gray line, not a bright line but a grey one. Well, we are making progress every single day, but I don't think the people that are drafting this legislation would agree that we are making progress every single day. So, therefore, by their judgment of this standard, that would mean that we begin pulling out July 1, 2007, just a few months from now, and may be even retroactive, be-

cause I don't think this bill can get out of this Congress by then.

Another one says, if key benchmarks are not met October 1, 2007, a redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq begins immediately and must be completed within 180 days.

It goes on and on. And, again, this is a huge, huge reach for Congress to get involved in the micromanagement of a war. There have always been consequences.

And, by the way, the gentleman from Mississippi that raised the issue of the appropriations bill in the early 1990s Congress that said, get out of Somalia, if you look at the aftermath of that, I think it would have been far better for the United States had we stayed and had we completed the mission there; it would be perhaps done by now and not a place where there are terrorists pulling into that. There has been a long, drawn out war in that area since that period of time that has washed back and forth across that countryside. And part of it is because we lacked resolve. And part of that is shown right here in the words of Muqtada al-Sadr.

So, Madam Speaker, I would bring up one more point, and that would be, we have made progress there. And the progress that we have made, some of it is measured by construction projects that are completed. There has been a lot that has been said about things not getting done in Iraq, and I would submit that I have been over there a number of times but twice specifically to review the construction projects that have been initiated and in progress and completed. And this shows in green the projects that are completed. Along that map, it is easy to see that we have got most of our work done. We are nearing the end really of all of them. The green are completed. The yellow is under construction, and the red are those that are planned but not started. Tiny little numbers under the red here. Big numbers under the green. Significantly smaller numbers than those that are under construction.

We have gotten a lot of projects completed, Madam Speaker, and we are almost to that point where we can wrap up this work that started here in Iraq, that started out with \$18.4 billion. We put supplemental funding in there. And then a final number, I can't speak to factually here on the floor, although it is significantly larger than \$18.4 billion. There has been a lot of infrastructure that has been picked up to speed. If you look around here on the edge, these are all border forts along the edge on the border between Iran and Iraq. That is also the case down along here with Jordan and Syria. We have fortified the border and put people there on the outposts. That has done a lot to slow things down, but it has not done enough to keep it from coming out of Iran.

I have been to a good number of these projects. Some would be sewer projects in Sadr City, Baghdad, itself that began about 3 years ago. And under the

first armored division controlling that, General Carelli, who is now the Corps commander there. I have been up here to the Kirkuk area where the mother of all generators sits there producing electricity 24 hours a day, every day, a gas-fired generator plant. There is work done all over this area. We have gone back and reflooded the swamps where the swamp Arabs lived that were dried up and drained by Saddam Hussein. They have moved back into that area. About 8,000 square miles were drained; we got about 4,000 square miles put back in. We have done a tremendous amount to improve the environment there in Iraq, and 80 percent of the violence is confined to Baghdad and 30 miles within Baghdad. So why would we be concerned that we can't control this or we can't manage this?

I would point out that, in 1944, on December 22 of 1944, the 101st airborne was surrounded at Bastogne, and the Nazis demanded that the 101st surrender. And General McCollum's response was a retort, it was "Nuts." The Germans didn't know how to understand that, Madam Speaker. But what it meant was: We are staying here. We have got you right where we want you. You are all around us. We can hit you. We can fire and hit you in any direction.

And the Americans underwent a relentless artillery barrage, but the response, the rhetoric, "Nuts" prevailed. And General Patton's Army was able to relieve the 101st Airborne. The 101st today contends they didn't need the help; they would have liked to just whip the Germans themselves.

That was the spirit we had in this country and our fighting personnel in December of 1944. When they were surrounded, and it was hopeless, they said, "Nuts." Now we have Baghdad surrounded and we have Baghdad penetrated, and all we have to do is maintain stability there, and we have people talking about surrender. And I think they are nuts, Madam Speaker, to talk about surrender with all of this investment in blood and treasure, to be so close to success and victory here, and to be waffling and go wobbly at a time when you need a spine and you need courage.

To bring this supplemental appropriations bill with all of these strings attached that are designed to appease the 75 or 76 members of the Out of Iraq Caucus and the left-winged liberals here in this Congress, not because of their leadership on war but because of their position on other issues, I think, is a disservice to the American people. The American people know how important this is. And the fathers and mothers, the widows and widowers, and sons and daughters of those who have given their lives for Iraqi freedom and a safer future for Americans must be respected and honored.

As the father of a son who was killed over there, a Gold Star father from California said to me, and his name was John, he said, "It is different now.

You can't pull out of there now, because that soil is sanctified by the blood of our children. You must stick with this battle and succeed and not lose your will."

As a major from Kentucky said to me the last time I was there, "We appreciate your prayers. We have everything we need to do what we have to do. We have all of the weapons we need and the clothing and the food and the training that we need, and all of the support that we need. So when you pray for us, pray for the American people. Pray that the American people understand this enemy that we are up against. Pray that the American people don't lose their resolve. We will not lose ours."

INSURANCE ISSUES IN WAKE OF KATRINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I have the great fortune to represent the people of south and coastal Mississippi, and I never want to miss the opportunity on their behalf to thank the other people of our great Nation for the help that has been provided to us in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, both individuals, Rotarians, college kids. But so many people have just been magnificent in their helping South Mississippi after the storm, and we want to thank you.

There has, Madam Speaker, unfortunately been a group that has been particularly unhelpful to the recovery of south Mississippi, and that is the insurance business, in particular the property and casualty business around the country.

I want to bring to your attention just one of the many of the thousands of homes in south Mississippi that were destroyed by the storm. The people there had insurance, contrary to what the Wall Street Journal will tell you. They had insurance against flood. They had insurance against wind. And when the storm came, they thought they were covered. And they woke up the day after the storm, and their homes were gone.

This is a sketch of Will Clark's home in Pass Christian, Mississippi. Being very fond of his place, he hired a local artist to sketch it. This is what it looked like the day before Katrina. That is what it looked like the day after.

Will, being a good businessman, had \$250,000 worth of homeowners insurance on his home. The folks from State Farm, within a few days of the storm, came to his property, looked around, said they saw no evidence of wind damage, despite all the things you see knocked down by the wind, and paid him nothing on his insurance claim. A \$250,000 policy paid him nothing.

The next homeowner I want to bring to your attention is the home of Mr.

and Mrs. James Scanlon. This is what it looks like. The Scanlons had \$304,000 worth of insurance on this home. The day after Katrina, it looked like that. The Scanlons were with Nationwide Insurance Company. Nationwide paid them \$13,000 on that damage. For those of you who have done some remodeling yourselves, you know that \$13,000 might replace that front door and maybe that window; \$304,000 worth of insurance paid them \$13,000.

The third one I want to bring to your attention is the home of Ms. Diane Quinn in Biloxi, Mississippi. To give you the magnitude of this storm, it stretched all the way from New Orleans to Mobile, Alabama. This is what Mrs. Quinn's home looked like the day before Katrina. She had \$249,000 worth of insurance with Allstate Insurance Company. The day after the storm, her home looked like that.

Within days of the storm, in addition to all the other trauma she had been to, the folks from Allstate, I believe that is "The Good Hands" folks, came and told her that they would give her \$10,000 for the loss of her home.

Mr. Speaker, there is zero Federal regulation of the insurance industry. When people came to me with claims like that and said, "What can you do for me," I had to give them the unfortunate answer, "Absolutely nothing." But it wasn't just these folks who were harmed by the storm, you see; it was every American.

The people that did pay claims was our Nation's flood insurance policy. The Nation's flood insurance policy is written in a way that we hire the private sector to sell that policy, and we hire the private sector to adjudicate the claim in events like this.

The problem that came in is, when those insurance agents went to those three properties, and even though the Navy tells us we had 5 hours of hurricane-force winds before the water got there, the insurance agents said, "We see no evidence of wind damage. So, therefore, we are not going to pay you on your homeowner's policy; you have to pay your flood policy."

Under the law, they are required to have a fair adjudication of the claim. And yet, at the same time that they require our Nation to have a fair adjudication of the claim, folks like State Farm and Nationwide are sending out memorandum to their claims adjusters, and this is a quote: "Where wind acts concurrently with flooding to cause damage to the insured's property, coverage for the loss exists only under the flood coverage." That means that not only these folks were cheated out of their homeowners policies, but you as taxpayers were cheated to pay claims that should have been paid by the insurance industry.

Now, the folks who run that company, a gentleman by the name of Ed Rust to be particular, rather than expressing remorse for what his company did to the people of America, was rewarded this year with a \$9,890,000 bonus

for telling folks like that, "We're not going to pay you."

Madam Speaker, this needs to be investigated. There are claims adjusters who were so disgusted with what they saw and what they did to individuals that they have turned the insurance industry in for this fraud that has been perpetrated upon the American people.

Madam Speaker, this Democratic Congress needs to keep faith with the people of America and investigate this, because I am convinced that the biggest Katrina fraud of all was ripping off the American taxpayer to the tune of billions of dollars.

□ 1600

DISASTER RELIEF FOR AFFECTED AREAS IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I, too, feel, as I believe most Americans do, for those who have been impacted by the effects of the disaster that occurred with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. And my colleague and good friend from Mississippi makes, I think, strong arguments that it is part of our responsibilities as representatives of the people's House, to, in fact, respond to needs and crises when natural disasters occur.

My district, the 20th Congressional District in California, includes the heart of California, some of the best farm land in the country, from Fresno in the north all the way down to Bakersfield in the south.

I rise this afternoon to address the concerns, the deep concerns that our constituents have because of a lack of Federal support in declaring Federal designation disaster status for the 31 counties in California that were impacted by the freeze that took place in California between January 11 and January 16.

Now, this is a disaster of significant proportions. Unlike a hurricane or a tornado, as we have witnessed recently in other parts of the country, a dramatic freeze takes on different visual effects. But the damages and the impacts to families and their children and people with farms and farm workers, compesinos, can be just as devastating.

Since January 11, January 16, doing our due diligence, Governor Schwarzenegger has declared 31 counties in California available for Federal designation disaster. Yet, we have gone now 6 to 7 weeks without the Federal Government responding. It believes now the total cost of the impact of this freeze to the farms, to the citrus industry, to the vegetable industry is totaling over \$1.3 billion and growing.

These farm workers, these compesinos, are out of work. These farmers have their life holdings in these citrus orchards. The communities, the economic impacts are reverberating throughout the communities within these 31 counties.

Last Friday, we had a listening session on the impacts of agriculture. We had members from the foodbank in California, the Fresno County foodbank, Sarah Reyes, an old friend and former colleague of mine. She indicated that over 3,100 households, which contain over 14,700 individuals, over 7,425 children under the age of 5 years of age or less, have been provided food because these folks have no jobs, because there are no jobs available, because the citrus industry and related industries have been devastated by this freeze.

It goes on. You know, in places like Orange Cove and Parlier and Reedley and Selma and places in Tulare County, we have seen the need to provide food for families increase 1,000, 2,000 percent. The UFW, faith-based organizations have chipped in. The State has paid millions of dollars. But yet the Federal Government response has been lacking.

We have had bipartisan support from Members of the California congressional delegation, by both our United States Senators. Congressman NUNES and myself have introduced an Impact for Freeze Relief for those farm workers, those farmers, their families and the businesses and these small communities. Yet the President has yet to declare, since January 11 through January 16, that these counties are deserving of Federal designation disaster relief.

But in the meantime, my colleagues, since December 19, 14 other States have been declared Federal designation disaster areas. Nebraska, December 19, for severe winter storms; Kansas, January 28, severe winter storms. The President, on January 7, declared both those States disaster areas. Missouri, Oklahoma, Florida, Illinois, Washington State, winter storms, mud slides, tornados, all deserving, I believe, and the President believed, for Federal designation disaster status.

Yet, 7 weeks later, California, that complied with all the requirements under the Federal law in which our Governor made the request, now finds itself, 7 weeks later, without the sort of Federal designation status that we deserve as taxpayers to the Federal Government.

We ask the President, please respond as you have responded in 14 other cases in these other States. Our citizens need the support and the same sort of help that we have given to other parts of the country.

So I ask, once again today, for the President to respond to FEMA and to produce the Federal designation disaster relief that our citizens in California deserve and need for those farmers, for their families, for those farm workers and for the communities they live in.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House once again. And as you know, the 30-Something Working Group, we come to the floor two, three, sometimes four times in a given week, in a legislative week, to share with the Members some of the issues that we are working on and some of the issues that we must tackle here in the 110th Congress.

As you know, the work of the 30-Something Working Group has been going on now for, going on close to 4 years of hard work and making sure that not only the will of the American people prevails in this House, the people's House, this U.S. House, but to make sure that we act, we legislate in an accountable way; also bring about the kind of oversight, and put us on the new direction that we need to be in several of the areas that we face now, such as Iraq, such as making sure that we have affordable health care, making sure that we have a clean environment, making sure that we take care of our veterans. And fiscal responsibility is the backdrop of the overall accountable flag that we stand under.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has happened in the last couple of weeks, and a lot has happened since the 110th Congress took control of the U.S. House of Representatives, Democratic control, and working in a bipartisan way.

I spent a lot of time on the floor in the past talking about the bipartisan votes that have taken place here on this floor because I think that it is something that we should all be proud of. I am not talking about proud Democrats. I am talking about Republicans, Independents that are paying attention to this process, Democrats, first time voters. Individuals that are thinking about voting should be encouraged about the spirit that we have here in the U.S. House of Representatives and making sure that we bring work products that a majority of the Members can vote for, and that means Democrats and Republicans.

These are a few of the votes that I just want to highlight here once again: implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations, H.R. 1, which was the first bill, Mr. Speaker, we spoke of that we had the opportunity to lead. When I say "we," I am saying the Democratic majority, to be able to bring to the floor, which was a bipartisan 9/11 Commission. And it was a book that many read, and one of the New York Times bestseller books. Passed 299-128, with 68 Republicans voting for it.

Raising the minimum wage, H.R. 2, which was the second bill in this 110th Congress, this Democratic Congress that came up. Again, we must be reminded that the vote was 315-116, with 82 Republicans voting with the Democrats on that particular measure.

Funding for enhancement of stem cell research, H.R. 3, again, bipartisan vote, 253-174.

Making prescription drugs more affordable for seniors, H.R. 4, 255-170, which is a majority vote in a bipartisan manner.

Something that really means a lot to the 30-Something Working Group, reversing the increase of interest rates to students and also American families that are trying to educate themselves to take advantage of the high-tech jobs that we are trying to provide, and also the skilled labor jobs that we are trying to generate here in our economy, cutting student loans, interest rates in half, which was H.R. 5, which passed by 356 votes to 71.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to really make a case in point as it relates to that particular vote because young people are our future, and even working, some folks think that many of our students graduate from high school and they go right into college. We have many working Americans that have to work and go to school at the same time, or have to work and then go to school later. And they have to take out these student loans. And cutting that interest rate in half is going to mean so much to the forward progress of our young people and our middle-age population that is trying to educate themselves to compete, not only with the person that is standing next to them, but compete against other countries.

And so our education, the education of the people of the United States of America is paramount. And I am so happy to see, and this was one of the major objectives of the 30-Something Working Group, not to just represent those that are graduating from high school, but to also represent those parents that are trying to pay for higher education for their children.

The greatest goal, I think, for a grandparent or a parent is to make sure that their children and grandchildren have better opportunities than what they have had. And I am excited about that opportunity that so many are going to have. Now, we have moved here in the House to cut those interest rates in half.

Also, creating long-term energy initiatives, which was H.R. 6, which passed 264-168, bipartisan vote, something that was needed as it relates to using subsidies for alternative fuels. Making sure that we invest in the Midwest versus the Middle East is something that we have all embraced and something that we all feel very strongly about.

I am going to keep sharing that, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is important. In the 109th Congress, I spent a lot of time here working with the 30-Something Working Group talking about the uncontrollable debt that the Republican Congress kept accruing on behalf of future generations. And I talked about that, and it was a chart, and I had a rubber stamp. But I am going to talk a little bit more about it as we start to look at this question of accountability, the question of oversight, the whole slogan of moving in a new direction, fiscal responsibility.

And I just want to make sure that I paint this picture, because what we are talking about now in the 30-Something Working Group, we used to talk about what we, if we had the opportunity to lead, what we will do. Now we are talking about what we are doing.

But to be able to really paint a good picture, Mr. Speaker, for not only the Members to understand, but also the American people to understand, this is where we are right now, and we didn't just get there last week.

As it relates to foreign debt held by foreign nations, this is as of December 2006. We updated this chart because we had numbers in place. As you know, we had the little Velcro numbers, which I understand that we are going to get that soon so that we can pull it off to really show what is happening here.

We have Japan, that owns a part of the American apple pie at \$644.3 billion. And I think that it is important to understand that they buy our debt. That means they have a piece of the American pie because of a lack of fiscal responsibility, because the President has passed budgets down that has asked for tax cuts for the super-wealthy, that we spent out of control with a lack of accountability and oversight, with two wars that are going on, just continuing to borrow the money with very little oversight.

I am setting the stage for a little later on in our talk here today.

We have China. As of 11/05 it was \$249.8 billion. And now, as of December 2006, China has moved up to \$349.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also important, and I want to ask staff if we can get that Bush chart with the Republican Congress if we have that because I want to just show how historical these numbers are, because one may say, well, you know, there are a couple of wars going on. We have had 9/11. We have had a number of issues.

I have a chart that is really going to show that that is contrary, that logic is contrary to the obvious of what has happened.

□ 1615

It is because the administration has decided to borrow from future generations and the present generation where the economic outlook for our children and grandchildren would not be what it should be because of our lack of responsibility. Thank God that we have a Congress in place right now that is going to put accountability first. Fiscal responsibility we have already adopted in our rules and continue to live under that flag of oversight and a new direction: \$349.6 billion; the U.K., \$239.1 billion; the Caribbean, \$68 billion; Taiwan \$63.1 billion. OPEC nations, again, these are oil-producing nations in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker. Many of these nations the United States have bilateral talks and agreements with, but many of them are in question as it relates to the present situation in the Middle East. But guess what? They

own a piece of the American apple pie. I don't even want to start to talk about gas prices and what is happening as it relates to OPEC nations. You have \$67.8 billion as of 11/2005. And now, Mr. Speaker, December of 2006, OPEC nations, they have gone up in owning more of the American apple pie due to a lack of fiscal responsibility on behalf of the Bush administration and the past Republican Congress. Of the budgets that they have passed, they now own \$100.9 billion of the American apple pie.

Korea, \$70 billion; Hong Kong, \$53.9 billion; Germany, \$52.5 billion.

I think it is important that we pay very close attention to those numbers, and that is something that we should be very concerned about and continue to keep our eye on the prize so that we spend in a fiscally responsible way and that we make sure that we are accountable to the American people. And I feel good about the fact that we have a majority that is willing to fight on behalf of the greater good to make sure that we work on behalf of all of the American people.

Now, this chart is a little old, Mr. Speaker, because these actually have the 2005 numbers, and we are updating it. This is something I feel very fond of because I always said that this chart is going to end up being a part of the national archives one day because it really shows a story, and it is factual.

President Bush in 4 years, in 4 years, has managed to borrow more from foreign nations than 42 Presidents in 224 years of history. Now, these are 2005 numbers. I mean, I just want to make sure that we understand that these are 2005 numbers. So the numbers are higher now. Forty-two Presidents, look at them. All the way from George Washington, they were only able to borrow \$1.01 trillion. President Bush and the Republican Congress, the 108th Congress and 109th Congress, borrowed \$1.05 trillion in just 4 years.

Now, one would say, how can that happen, Mr. Speaker? How do these countries, China of all countries, Red China, own so much of the American apple pie?

Well, I can tell you how it happens. It has happened because the past Republican Congress rubber stamped everything that the Bush administration sent to this floor at the objection of so many Members of the House.

But now the proper leadership has stepped forward and said that we are going to pay as we go. So that means that this budget process will be more controlled than it has ever been in recent history of saying that, if you are going to spend, you are going to show how you are going to pay for it. Not where you are going to get it from because we know where they got it from. They borrowed it. It is like taking out a high-interest credit card and saying, I am knowingly and willingly using this high-interest credit card to carry out spending that I know I can't afford to spend. I know this. I mean, it is not

that it is an emergency. In the budget that the President has sent to this U.S. House of Representatives, the Bush administration budget, it is saying, let us make the tax cuts permanent for the super wealthy. Meanwhile, these countries that I outlined are paying for that tax cut. And I think it is important that we look at that. That is the fiscal responsibility end of the talk here today.

I think it is also important for us to realize the discussion that we are having now on Iraq, Mr. Speaker. We talked about oversight. We talked about accountability. But to date, as of last week, last Friday, there have been 81 hearings on the issue of oversight and accountability on Iraq, across the committees in the House. And I think it is important that the Members pay very close attention to this because, as these hearings continue to happen, we have learned more about what is happening in Iraq, what is happening in Afghanistan, what is happening with our troops here and our veterans here on the ground; hearings were not happening at this rate in the past.

Again, one of the obligations of the 30-Something Working Group is to make sure that everyone and every Member of the House understands that we are here to work, that we are here to make sure that accountability blows through the air conditioning ducts here in the hospital House.

Why are we spending so much time talking about Iraq? Next week there will be a supplemental that will be in committee, and it will be marked up. What we call a markup, that means that there will be a discussion about what goes into that supplemental bill. There will be appropriations, some \$100 billion-plus, that will be in this bill, from what I understand. Why are we spending so much time having so many conversations about what should be in that bill?

This is why, Mr. Speaker: On March 8, as of 10 a.m., 3,178 U.S. troops died; dead, period. As of March 9, which is today, Mr. Speaker, 10 a.m., we have 3,186 troops that are dead. Now, I said, 3,178, as of yesterday, 10 a.m. Today, as of 10 a.m., 3,186. That is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, so many Members are spending time focusing on this issue of Iraq accountability and benchmarks on behalf of the American people and those that are in harm's way. That is not a Democratic issue. That is not a Republican issue. That is not an Independent issue. That is an issue that should be dealt with at the U.S. Congress, and it is going to take courage and leadership and commitment and some tenacity to bring about the kind of change that needs to happen to make sure that those individuals that have died in the line of duty, that their memory is not in vain, and that we accomplish and we have benchmarks and we take the training wheels off the Iraqi government, period, dot. I can't sugarcoat it. It is what it is, and it has to be laid out that way for folks to un-

derstand, for the Members to understand, I must add, that it is very important. This conversation and this debate and the discourse that is taking place in committee, it is very serious, and it should be above politics.

The American people sent a very strong message in November. Democrats and Republicans, I am just going to say, the American people, period, sent a very strong message in November that they wanted to move in a new direction. They want more accountability. They want more oversight out of this U.S. House of Representatives. And they understand what is going on in the White House. There are places where Republicans won elections by landslides in the past. And guess what? In the November election, you couldn't elect a Republican as far as the eye can see or within eight or nine area codes because of the lack of oversight and accountability that was not carried out here in this House in the last couple of sessions of Congress versus this session.

Why is this issue important? As of 10 o'clock today, 23,924 wounded and 10,627 of those cannot return to battle or to duty.

What is in this so-called Defense supplemental bill? Some may talk about benchmarks. I want to talk a little bit about what is in the bill or what is going to be in the bill as the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee starts to what we call mark up and create this bill. The Speaker has said that U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act will provide our troops with equipment they need and require Iraqis to take control of their own country, help fight the war on terror and establish a date of withdrawal from Iraq.

Well, what is wrong with that? What is wrong with making sure our troops have what they need when they go to war? Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor 2 weeks ago because I happened to pick up the paper, and I saw some Members were complaining about the fact that the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee was looking to put language in the bill that said, if you are going to deploy a troop into harm's way that that soldier or that troop, that Marine or that sailor or that airman or that Coast Guard person, National Guard, Reserves, you name it, that they have to have the equipment they need to carry out the mission. What is wrong with that? That is almost like sending a football player out in the field without a helmet and shoulder pads and saying, go play. This is serious business. And I named the number of those that are wounded and have died, and I can guarantee you, if we had had some of the language that we are talking about in place, maybe, just maybe, a number of those individuals would be living today. It is important. We are not four-star generals. We are Members of Congress. And we have been sent here to make sure that we are accountable to those that have signed up in a

volunteer Army and a volunteer Marine Corps and a volunteer Navy and a volunteer Air Force to go defend this country and that have allowed us to salute one flag. It is our responsibility and our duty. And while we carry out that responsibility and duty, one may be misunderstood every now and then. And if it is about being misunderstood, then that means that you are not leading.

My mother served in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, prior to my arrival here, and she said, "Son, if you are not misunderstood from time to time, you are not leading."

I am glad to pick up periodicals, and I am glad to see the kind of discourse that is taking place on television, folks talking about what the Congress is doing, because you know something? At least we are doing something about the status quo. No longer will this House stand by, Mr. Speaker, and watch those that are unelected carry out the duties that the Congress should be carrying out.

I have been on the Armed Services Committee now three Congresses, Mr. Speaker, and I can tell you many times I sit there and I watch individuals that are on the panel before us, and I kind of want to ask the question, but I don't want to be sarcastic by saying, I hope you are not filling me with confidence that the troops have everything they need.

When I came to Congress, we went into Iraq. I wasn't here for the vote to go or to give the President authority or what have you, but I was here, and I remember asking the question, are we ready for this guerrilla warfare once we reach Baghdad? That answer was, "yes." Do we have the equipment in place? That answer was, "yes." Do we have up-armored vehicles in place? That answer was, "yes."

News report after news report, document after document this big, Mr. Speaker, says the contrary. Two trips to Iraq represents something different from what I heard here in a committee room in the Rayburn Building that the troops have what they need. Well, guess what? We no longer want to go off of what someone tells us in Washington, D.C., that is happening or not. We want the President to have to be able to confirm that there is a need for additional troops or to send additional troops to Iraq. We want to make sure that the troops know that there is a Congress here that is going to put that language in place to make sure they have what they need.

I can't tell you how many marines and how many soldiers told me, sir, with all due respect, sir, I will be here as long as you want me here, but I went on a patrol the other night, and I didn't have the proper equipment. I didn't have the up-armored vehicles. And it takes a Member of Congress to go to someone and say, I heard a patrol went out last night and didn't have what they needed.

□ 1630

We are not trying to make command decisions on the ground. We are just trying to make sure the men and women have what they need.

Also within this supplemental that we are looking at is legislation that prohibits the deployment of troops that are not fully mission capable as defined by the Department of Defense. In other words, troops who are not fully trained, equipped and protected by the standards of the Department of Defense will not go.

Now, this is what the Department of Defense has asked for. Why can't the Congress then back up the Department of Defense and say we agree with you, even though we know you have not been practicing some of the things that you have adopted as policy?

The President can only deploy unprepared troops if he certifies in writing to Congress that the deployment of those troops are in the national interest. That means it is imperative that we send troops that are untrained and unprepared into harm's way. The President has to confirm that it is within the national interest that that should happen. That is not taking his powers away as Commander in Chief, it is just putting in another level of accountability, making sure that the President knows that there is a Congress here that is willing to carry out the accountability and the oversight that is needed.

It also provides that the Veterans Administration has to meet the obligations of the new generation of veterans that will be coming out of two of these wars.

There are two wars going on, Mr. Speaker. A lot of folks forget. Iraq? Okay. Afghanistan. But guess what? There are two different wars going on. Because of the lack of planning in the Iraq war, troops were sent to Iraq from Afghanistan, and guess what? The Taliban is back and strong in Afghanistan. Now we need more troops, more coalition troops, because of the decisions that were made in a Congress that did not provide the oversight that it should have provided to make sure that we brought about ultimate accountability. I think it is important that we endorse the philosophy that we are going to prepare for what is to come.

It is time for the Iraqis to take control of Iraq. We say it all the time. In this bill, the bill will require that the Iraqi government has to meet key security, political and economic benchmarks that were established, Mr. Speaker, by the President of these United States on January 10 when he addressed this Congress. What is wrong with that? The President said if it doesn't happen, then they will see a withdrawal and we will not be there forever. I am paraphrasing. This is what the President said.

Now, being a Member of Congress, now going on my third term, I think it is very important for us to understand,

there are some things that the President has said during the State of the Union that ended up being reality, or becoming reality, and there are a lot of things that he said that did not.

I trust the fact that the Commander in Chief and Members of Congress will not send someone into war unprepared. I will trust that. I would want to believe that. But we know that it has happened, where we failed our troops as it relates to getting them what they need.

But I think it is important for us to understand, Mr. Speaker and Members, it is very, very important that we put in the language of this supplemental, which I must add, let me break this down more, when I say defense supplemental bill, that means this is an appropriations bill that is going to be \$100 billion that will go towards operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and in other parts of the world as it relates to this issue of fighting terrorism. But it should not be a blank check. It should not be a one line bill.

Some would like to leave it up to the Pentagon. Leave it up to folks who we don't have any idea, the public, who they are. Unelected individuals. Leave it up to them. They know what is best. They are the professionals.

Well, I believe in professionalism too. But when I go down to the Seventeenth Congressional District of Florida and my constituents ask me, Congressman, what did you do to make sure that my tax dollar is being spent appropriately? "Well, they just said send the money. I thought it was important. We just voted and let them deal with it."

It is not an us and them. It is a we. And when money is spent in an inappropriate way, when you have companies like Halliburton and other contractors that are under investigation, I must add, that are still receiving contracts, U.S. Federal contracts, the taxpayer dollar, then we have to have accountability.

Now, I don't know anyone that really has a problem with that. I can go to a rally of conservative to the right of the right of the right Republicans and ask them, do you want accountability measures in a \$100 billion-plus supplemental bill, or do you just want us to pass it and say leave it up to whoever is making the decisions in whatever department they are in with no-bid contracts and allow some of the things that happened in Iraq, when companies get a flat tire and then they torch the truck and we buy a brand new tractor-trailer because it was better for the company if they just replace the truck. Which one do you want? Do you want accountability measures in it? Do you want benchmarks in it? Do you want to have hearings?

Do you see the number? Oh, goodness, I am glad the staff changed this for me, Mr. Speaker. It is that quick. I started talking about last week's numbers. I get new numbers. Ninety-seven hearings held on Iraq oversight. Do you want this? Or do you want seven hear-

ings? Which one do you want? Do you want 96 hearings, or do you want seven?

We have Members around here complaining saying, oh, well, you know, I don't necessarily like all this, you know, what is going on.

Well, it is our job. When we have two wars going on and we have the kind of lack of fiscal responsibility that has not been taking place here in this House prior to the arrival of the Democratic controlled Congress, you have to sleep in shifts. You have to make sure you do what your obligation is, to have oversight.

I think it is important to be able to make sure if the Iraqis fail to meet the benchmarks, that it will mean the beginning of a U.S. withdrawal and that it will also restrict economic aid to the Iraqis.

The bottom line is, you cannot reward bad behavior or lack of good behavior. You can't reward that. You can't say, well, no, that is okay, that is fine. Take your time, whatever the case may be. Don't worry about it.

I'll tell you, there are some Iraqi forces that are fighting. There are some Iraqi forces that are doing some good things. But there are some folks within the Iraqi government that do not understand the urgency we have here.

The longer we are in Iraq, the more I have to tell my U.S. mayors, my Governors, my school board members, my constituents, no, I cannot help you with your project. No, I cannot help you, Governor, as it relates to the transportation dollars to help Florida become even a stronger State in the United States of America. Mr. Mayor, I know it is important that we have security in our community. Mr. Sheriff, I know it is important that you want that COPS Program back. But guess what? We have two wars going on. We got a tax cut for the super-wealthy that the President of the United States wants, and we are too busy fighting them on that. And meanwhile, we got folks foot dragging over in Iraq about accountability. They don't have any urgency. Some folks don't even have the urgency we have here in the United States.

This is snatching bread and butter out of the mouths of U.S. taxpayers and their children. Do you know why the interest rates went up on the student loans? To be able to pay for tax cuts for the super-wealthy, and to also continue the business of saying let's just rubber stamp supplementals and send it to the President of the United States and the Bush administration and the Department of Defense. And it took an election to bring about the kind of paradigm shift and the thinking that we should have done on our own as responsible adults and elected to U.S. Congress. It took an election to do that.

Thank God for democracy. Thank God for level-minded Americans saying I am going to put my party aside for a

moment. I have to stand up on behalf of my children, because this is now becoming personal. You have veterans that have served and that have fought and that have allowed us to salute one flag who are just turned, totally, politically about who they sent to Congress, and they made a change. And we are not going to sit there and allow their vote and their prayer and their hope that there will be change here in Washington, D.C., and just sit by and say we want to go along to get along.

Someone says something about maybe I am doing the wrong thing, and who am I to try to govern a war from Washington, D.C.? It is not governing a war. It is bringing about the kind of accountability that the American people have cried and have asked for.

The Bush administration and the Republican majority in the past are far, far behind where the American people are. And if we have to drag, pull, through this House and push legislation through to bring us up-to-date to where the American people are, that is what we were sent here to do. And Members who don't want to be a part of that experience, they have to go home and they have to face their constituents.

Believe what I am telling you right now. It is not just individuals that are walking around with flowers and saying "I don't believe in war" that are saying that we have to bring some accountability to what we are doing. There are individuals that work hard, individuals that have retired, individuals that are looking for a better future for their family. You have local government officials that don't even know how they are going to survive from this point on because we are sitting around here cutting taxes for individuals who are not even asking for tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: Super-wealthy billionaires that are not even marching the halls of Congress and saying please give me a tax cut, they are not asking for it. The Republican Congress just gave it to them.

So this paradigm shift, I want to prepare the Members, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to take some courage, and it is going to take some leadership, and we are going to be misunderstood. But you know something? Time after time again, history has reflected on leadership in a good way.

I can tell you right now, a perfect example, Mr. Speaker, and then I am going to move to the next point, when the Walter Reed story broke about what was going on at Walter Reed, and the Newsweek cover of this specialist here, this amputee that served and the kind of treatment that our soldiers were receiving at Walter Reed, the vindication for the Democratic majority was the fact that before this article came out, before we even knew of a Washington Post story, or probably even before the reporter started working on the story, we had an appropriation continuing resolution that we had

to pass because the Republican Congress did not do their job and pass their appropriations bill, and we put \$3.6 billion towards veteran healthcare because it was the right thing to do.

And the good thing about it is that I could stand here on this floor without any Member being able to march down here and say otherwise, that we did what we had to do because we had the opportunity to do it. And that is what is so good about good leadership.

I am glad NANCY PELOSI is the Speaker of the House, and if there are some Members that have a problem with that, then they have a problem with leadership, because this could have happened last year, it could have happened the year before last.

The Bush administration has passed time after time again budgets that have cut veterans healthcare. Again, Bush Republicans, see this, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you right now, I can't think of anything else I could be doing outside of making this point right now. This is very, very important. And I want my Republican colleagues to be with us on this change that we are working on. I want our new Members in Congress to understand their responsibility as it relates to the American people and what they sent us here for.

We have to have resolve, just like the men and women on the front line have resolve. We have to have resolve, just like the veterans who went out there and laid their lives down and watched their friends pay the ultimate sacrifice. We have to have that same resolve. We have to have that political courage, like they have to have the courage to go outside the gates of Camp Victory in Iraq.

We have to have that same resolve here in this House. We cannot allow someone just because they say something about you or they think something about you when you are right, that you are going to turn around, just because someone on the minority side, on the Republican side, is saying well, look what they are trying to do.

Well, you know something? I say to my Republican colleagues, in all due respect, and many of them are my friends, especially the leadership, the bottom line is when you are pointing your finger and saying look at what they are doing, you need to be looking in the mirror and saying you had the opportunity to do it and you didn't do it, and we are not getting back in the same boat that you just got out of. We are going to do it. We are going to grab a paddle and we are going to go down the stream.

Summer of 2005, at the Democrats' pressure, the Bush administration finally acknowledged that FY 2006 shortfall in veteran healthcare was totaling \$2.7 billion and Democrats fought all summer to get it.

March 2006, President Bush budget cut veteran funding by \$6 billion over 5 years. Passed by the Republican-controlled Congress.

□ 1645

January 31, 2007, Democrats increase VA health care budget by \$3.6 billion in a joint resolution funding.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues who are against that kind of action to go home and tell your constituents that you are against that. I welcome you to do it because you won't be a Member of Congress anymore. I am so glad I was on the prevailing side of \$3.6 billion going into veterans' health care.

I say all of that because we use key words like accountability, oversight. We talk about a new direction and fiscal responsibility. I can tell you, there are many times here on this House floor that Members are going to have to go see the wizard and get some courage. That courage is very easy because the American people are egging on this kind of spirit that is in Washington, D.C., right now.

I think it is important that, even after all of the articles and even after all of the talk about what went on at Walter Reed dealing with our veterans, that the Democratic-controlled Congress sprung into action, not weeks, not months down the road, not years down the road, sprung into action. Articles came out in the Washington Post. I have it right here. We don't come to the floor to play around or waste Members' time or staff time. I think it is important to talk about the fact that articles came out on the 24th. There was a review panel. We looked at the Army Times article that came out in September 2006, but when articles started rolling out on the 19th and after that on the 26th, and then on March 2nd because we were on President's break, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform subpoenaed one of the major generals who was fired, who was head of Walter Reed after Army officials refused to allow him to testify before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, that is what oversight is about. It was not firing a general. It is about getting down to the truth. And, of course, the administration took the position to ask him to step down.

March 5 of this year, this is all recent, oversight in Committee on Government Reform began holding investigation hearings into the Walter Reed scandal.

March 6 and 7, House Veterans' Affairs Committee holds hearings on Walter Reed scandal.

The same day, March 7, House Armed Services Committee holds Walter Reed scandal hearing. I was there.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to all members in the Army and those who came, and Secretary Chao and all of the folks over at the Pentagon, they did apologize. They did say they were sorry. I can give them credit for that. But I am thinking about the men and women, as we continue to peel back what has been happening at Walter Reed, and as we continue to learn about other DOD medical facilities and

the service that they are not providing, as we learn these things, we have to go about correcting them.

I would much rather appropriate dollars to make sure that someone's uncle, someone's mother, someone's daughter, someone's nephew who laid it down on behalf of this country gets what we said we would give them. That is quality health care, accountability and oversight.

If any Member has a problem with that, they need to evaluate themselves or their purpose here in Congress. I am glad to hear many Members saying to the Army: Tell us what you need. Now there will be strings attached, and there will be language to bring about oversight. And there will be individuals who will be paying attention to what you are doing. The old days of giving you the money and you just doing what you want to do are over. Accountability measures will be in place.

As we start to look at next week and as we start to move into next week, I think it is important that folks understand that this is going to be an open House, and we are going to promote government and crack down on waste. That is what next week is going to be all about. Next week is going to be about trying to crack down on waste and for us to start turning this around and balancing the budget. And of course, only Democrats can say we have actually balanced the budget because we have. Republicans had 12 years of control and did not balance the budget. They talked about it but did not do it. We did it.

To be able to say that, again, we need to crack down and highlight and investigate waste. We are here representing the American people. We are not just here representing ourselves. No, I am not here to represent Kendrick Meek. I am here to represent those who have sent me here and those that are counting on us to do the things that we have to do.

The Democrats have pledged to end the culture of corruption in Washington, making the Congress accountable to the people by sheer good government. What is wrong with that?

Next week the House will consider measures to ensure that the Federal Government is open and accountable to the American people. The legislation that is going to be brought up next week is going to be the whistleblower reforms, strengthening protections for Federal whistleblowers to prevent abuse, a lack of accountability. We want to empower those who want to step forward and say, there is corruption and waste over there. We want to insulate those individuals. They are our heroes and the heroes within the Federal Government and contracting world pointing out waste.

When we have countries like OPEC and China owning so much of the American pie, in the billions, that is a national security issue. So we need to treat these individuals accordingly.

Also next week, Presidential record disclosure, which nullifies the 2001

Presidential executive order and restores public access to Presidential records. That is important. Of course, there will be language as relates to super national security issues. They won't be able to touch those.

Presidential library donations, require the disclosure of donors to Presidential libraries. We have a lot of that going on. Additional material will be shared next week as it relates to the bills that will be coming to the floor, but I think it is important that we have the kind of flow to the House floor that we need to have to be able to prepare ourselves to govern for the rest of the 110th Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we continue in the 30-Something Working Group to look at issues that we travel the country to hear Americans and those that have come to Washington, D.C., looking for accountability; as we carry their prayer and their hope, and again I am not talking about proud Democrats, I am talking about all Americans, it is our obligation and responsibility to make sure that they get the best representation possible. And it should not be in the back halls of Congress, a deep secret in the corner or some sort of special meeting in the corner over here. It should be under the lights of this Chamber and to make sure that every Member understands.

One of the other principles of the 30-Something Working Group, on this side of the aisle and the Democratic Caucus, we want to make sure that every Member knows exactly what he or she is doing and has the information that they need, so they know what is coming up, they know what we have done, they know the responsibility that we have to carry out as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, because we don't want the American people to be cheated in anyway by saying, you know, when I voted on that, I didn't quite know what was going on. I'm sorry I voted against that, veteran.

If you voted against the continuing resolution, then you voted against \$3.6 billion on behalf of veterans' health care.

Now for you to be a Member of Congress and not to know that, something is wrong, because that is the number one group that is counting on you to do the right thing on their behalf. They have families, too.

They are elderly, too. They allow us to be able to salute one flag. I say that time and time again. I get chills, bumps every time I say it, because it is important.

My children have a better value for the service that our men and women carry out because they hear me talk about it constantly. We travel and we talk and read about foreign countries and what is happening there. America is the best and the most free country on the face of the earth, and we want to keep it that way. Whatever we have

to do to keep it that way, we are willing to do it. But we are going to do it in a coordinated fashion. We are not just going to do it entrusting others somewhere in some building in Virginia, Maryland, or Washington, D.C., that are not empowered and validated by the people of the United States of America and sent here to watch out for their best interest.

There are parents right now, when I go grocery shopping in my district, Mr. Speaker, I have parents walk up to me and say, Congressman, my son is 16, how long is this Iraq thing going to be going on?

I have to be brutally honest with them. I say, listen, as we talk about redeployment of troops, we have to understand, we are still in Korea and we are still in Germany. But the real issue is, we have to bring about the kind of coordination that is needed on the accountability end. We don't want to be putting brigades and platoons and saying, you run over here. That is the generals' job. That is not what we are doing.

We are making sure that the troops have what they need so when a general says, go over here or send three brigades over there, they have all of the equipment and logistical support that they need, and they have their mission and they have the things that they need to carry out that mission. That is what we are calling for.

We are also calling for the Iraqi government to stop playing with the United States Government. It will not be allowed. So give us more time, give us another chance, don't worry about it, as long as the U.S. troops are there, and other countries have already announced redeployment of their troops. We are sending more troops. You heard the number, and I will close with this, a number that I shared with you at the beginning, March 8, 10 a.m., 3,178 troops gone.

The next day, the next day, 10 a.m., March 9, 3,186 troops gone. That is the next day.

So this is beyond serious. These are families. And there are individuals that are counting on us to lead, and as long as you have a Democratic majority in this House, they will get that leadership because the will and the desire is there. The political courage is there to do it, and the American people are 110 percent behind accountability, fiscal responsibility, moving in a new direction. They are in that circle with the leadership of this House right now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker and the Democratic leadership for allowing the 30-Something Working Group to have an hour two nights ago and tonight to share the message with the Members of the House. It was an honor addressing the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in the district.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOLT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WAXMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONAWAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, March 15 and 16.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COSTA, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 12, 2007, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

794. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Inflation Adjustment of Acquisition-Related Thresholds (DFARS 2004-D022) (RIN: 0750-AF16) received February 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

795. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revisions to the Official Sign Indicating Insured Status (RIN: 3133-AD18) received February 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

796. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change of Using Agency for Restricted Areas R-3008A, B, C, D; Grand Bay Weapons Range, GA. [Docket No. FAA-2006-26273; Airspace Docket No. 06-A50-16] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

797. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, A321 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24431; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-011-AD; Amendment 39-14648; AD 2006-12-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

798. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25030; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-14649; AD 2006-12-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

799. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 95-ANE-10-AD; Amendment 39-14650; AD 2006-12-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

800. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22481; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-176-AD; Amendment 39-14647; AD 2006-12-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

801. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives Raytheon Model HS.125 Series 700A and 700B Airplanes; Model BAe.125 Series 800A (Including Variants C-29A and U-125), 800B, 1000A, and 1000B Airplanes; and Hawker 800 (Including Variant U-125A), 800XP, and 1000 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25011; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-118-AD; Amendment 39-14646; AD 2006-12-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

802. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC130 B4 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2006-24807; Directorate Identifier 2005-SW-41-AD; Amendment 39-14603; AD 2006-10-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

803. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 301.7805-1: Rules and Regulations (RIN: Rev. Rul. 2007-14) received February 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 985. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify which disclosures of information are protected from prohibited personnel practices; to require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements to the effect that such policies, forms, and agreements are consistent with certain disclosure protections, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 110-42, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1254. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations (Rept. 110-43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1255. A bill to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records; with amendments (Rept. 110-44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the Committee on Armed Services discharged from further consideration, H.R. 985 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BACA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARROW, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of

Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEHEAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MICA, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RENZI, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALDARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRE, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. WAMP, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1424. A bill to amend section 712 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, section 2705 of the Public Health Service Act, and section 9812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require equity in the

provision of mental health and substance-related disorder benefits under group health plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POE, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 1425. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4551 East 52nd Street in Odessa, Texas, as the "Staff Sergeant Marvin "Rex" Young Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H.R. 1426. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans enrolled in the health system of the Department of Veterans Affairs the option of receiving covered health services through facilities other than those of the Department; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. WATT, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1427. A bill to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 1428. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce the eligibility age for receipt of non-regular military service retired pay for members of the Ready Reserve in active federal status or on active duty for significant periods; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WU, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. CLARKE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 1429. A bill to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KUHLMANN of New York, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1430. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the diversity immigrant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WAMP, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 1431. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to establish provisions with respect to religious accommodation in employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 1432. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1433. A bill to provide for the treatment of the District of Columbia as a Congressional district for purposes of representation in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ALTMIRE (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 1434. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 896 Pittsburgh Street in Springdale, Pennsylvania, as the "Rachel Carson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 1435. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot program to reduce the backlog of claims for benefits pending with the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 1436. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 1437. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent the deduction for qualified tuition and

related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAUNO:

H.R. 1438. A bill to establish demonstration projects to provide at-home infant care benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1439. A bill to provide for free mailing privileges for personal correspondence and parcels sent to members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty in Iraq or Afghanistan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 1440. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Men's Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 1441. A bill to prohibit the sale by the Department of Defense of parts for F-14 fighter aircraft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 1442. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate automatic increases for inflation from CBO baseline projections for discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1443. A bill to treat arbitration clauses which are unilaterally imposed on consumers as an unfair and deceptive trade practice and prohibit their use in consumer transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HALL of New York:

H.R. 1444. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make interim benefit payments under certain remanded claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1445. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the exclusion from gross income for amounts paid to individuals pursuant to the Road Home program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JINDAL:

H.R. 1446. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow an increased deferment period for loans under the 7(b) loan program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 1447. A bill to amend sections 5313 and 5318 of title 31, United States Code, to reform certain requirements for reporting cash transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. EDWARDS):

H.R. 1448. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Hospital Quality

Report Card Initiative to report on health care quality in Department of Veterans Affairs hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SALI, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 1449. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for reassignment of certain Federal cases upon request of a party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H.R. 1450. A bill to create 4 new permanent judgeships for the eastern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 1451. A bill to provide incentives to reduce dependence on foreign oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Science and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 1452. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require the disclosure of certain information by persons conducting phone banks during campaigns for election for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. GORDON):

H.R. 1453. A bill to provide for communications training to improve the ability of scientists to interact with policymakers; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California (for himself and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 1454. A bill to create 4 new permanent judgeships for the eastern district of California, to provide for an additional place of holding court in the eastern district of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MEEKS of New York):

H.R. 1455. A bill to establish the African Burial Ground International Memorial Museum and Educational Center in New York, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SPACE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 1456. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to allow for certain claims of nationals of the United States against Turkey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SALI, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 1457. A bill to provide for research on, and services for individuals with, post-abortion depression and psychosis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. POE, Mr. KUHLMANN of New York, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income gain on the sale or exchange of farmland development rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TANNER (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WAMP, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HODES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. REYES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1459. A bill to improve Medicare beneficiary access by extending the 60 percent compliance threshold used to determine whether a hospital or unit of a hospital is an inpatient rehabilitation facility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 1460. A bill to commend the members of the United States Armed Forces on their performance and bravery in Iraq, to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 107-243), to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a plan for the phased redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq, to establish a Coordinator for Iraq Stabilization, and to place conditions on the obligation of funds to the Government of Iraq based on the achievement of benchmarks established by Iraq and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 1461. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to ban abusive credit practices, enhance consumer disclosures, protect underage consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 1462. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the implementation of the Platte River Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Species in the Central and Lower Platte River Basin and to modify the Pathfinder Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. TANCREDI):

H.R. 1463. A bill to provide a source of funds to carry out restoration activities on Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 1464. A bill to assist in the conservation of rare felids and rare canids by supporting and providing financial resources for the conservation programs of nations within the range of rare felid and rare canid populations and projects of persons with demonstrated expertise in the conservation of rare felid and rare canid populations; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WEXLER:

H.R. 1465. A bill to provide additional discretion to the Secretary of Homeland Security in designating countries eligible to participate in the visa waiver program under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 1466. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to permit qualifying States to use a portion of their allotments under the State children's health insurance program for any fiscal year for certain Medicaid expenditures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. GINGREY):

H.R. 1467. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to award grants to institutions of higher education to develop and offer education and training programs; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. CARDOZA (for himself, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. FARR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. BACA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution honoring the life of Ernest Gallo; to the Com-

mittee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASCARELL, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued honoring Varian Fry, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RENZI, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H. Res. 231. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require all committees post record votes on their web sites within 48 hours of such votes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. RENZI, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H. Res. 232. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to pregnancy resource centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Res. 233. A resolution recognizing over 200 years of sovereignty of the Principality of Liechtenstein, and expressing support for efforts by the United States continue to strengthen its relationship with that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself and Mr. LEE):

H. Res. 234. A resolution congratulating Wyclef Jean for being named the "Roving Ambassador" for Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. GALLEGLEY):

H. Res. 235. A resolution supporting an upgrade in Israel's relationship with NATO to that of a leading member of NATO's Mediterranean dialogue and to that of a member of NATO's Partnership for Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 36: Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

H.R. 39: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 42: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 45: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 73: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 82: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Vir-

ginia, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 146: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 171: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 180: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 226: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 243: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 245: Mr. WAMP, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 255: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 260: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 303: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. WU.

H.R. 315: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 367: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 380: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. OLIVER, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 393: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 397: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 418: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 432: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 463: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 473: Mr. SALI.

H.R. 493: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 506: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KIND, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 510: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 511: Mr. ISSA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 550: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GERLACH, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 552: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 553: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 579: Mr. WU, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 592: Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 618: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 621: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KAGEN, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 624: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 625: Mrs. BONO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 627: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 628: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 636: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 642: Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLEAV-ER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIER-REZ, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 643: Mr. WAMP, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 654: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KIND, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 657: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 667: Mr. HARE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. CUBIN, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 670: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 685: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr.

JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 690: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 695: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 711: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 713: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 721: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 725: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 741: Mr. WELCH of Vermont and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 756: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 779: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 787: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 790: Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 814: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 821: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 822: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 861: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 881: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 887: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 891: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 894: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HILL, Mr. KIND, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 901: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 934: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 954: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 960: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 962: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 970: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 972: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 980: Mr. CLAY and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 984: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 985: Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 998: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1014: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1022: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1029: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KIND, and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 1030: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1031: Mr. FORBES and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1032: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1038: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1043: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 1048: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1061: Mr. McCOTTER and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1063: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JINDAL, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1072: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1073: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. REYES, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1076: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1093: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1099: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 1102: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SHULER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 1108: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1111: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1112: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1117: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1121: Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 1122: Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 1125: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HARE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1127: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1132: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1150: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1153: Ms. FOX.

H.R. 1154: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1188: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 1193: Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 1194: Mrs. BONO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1211: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. McCOTTER, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 1225: Mr. McNULTY and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1228: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

H.R. 1229: Mr. PLATTs, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 1230: Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1239: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1246: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1252: Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1254: Ms. WATSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1255: Ms. WATSON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1261: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. McCOTTER, Ms. FOX, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1279: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 1280: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1282: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1283: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PORTER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1293: Ms. BERKLEY and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 1298: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1304: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1307: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1314: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1323: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 1325: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1330: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 1333: Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1342: Mr. POE and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1347: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1350: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CARSON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1354: Mr. ARCURI and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 1359: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1362: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1372: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1391: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1395: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 1398: Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1403: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1409: Mr. McCOTTER and Mr. CONYERS.

H.J. Res. 12: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. PLATTs.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. COHEN and Mr. STARK.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. WU.

H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ARCURI.

H. Con. Res. 25: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. SPACE.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. REYES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HARE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOEBsACK, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Con. Res. 71: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. McCOTTER and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 37: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Res. 100: Mr. RUSH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HARE, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H. Res. 107: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. McCOTTER, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H. Res. 111: Mr. LAHOOD.

H. Res. 113: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 118: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 119: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. McGOVERN.

H. Res. 121: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 125: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 128: Mr. SAXTON.

H. Res. 136: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H. Res. 197: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 208: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 221: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CARSON, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Res. 222: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 223: Mrs. SCHMIDT.